Frances Burney d'Arblay and Anglican Womanhood, 1752 – 1840.

Daniel James Edward Alexander Waterfield.

Queens' College.
March, 2019.

This dissertation is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Acknowledgements:

With thanks to Andrew C. Thompson, Sophie Coulombeau, Peter Sabor, Catherine Nygren, John Overholt, Amy Erickson, Nicholas Dixon, and to Kevin Feeney, Tim Oliver, Chris Evans, Henry Coleman, Anthony Breach, Jack Thompson, Toby Waterworth, Finn Trevarthen-Darby, Greg Williams, Jacob Weinbren, Ruth Rimmer, and Chris Terry for making sure I didn't slack. I gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Pigott Foundation, McGill-ASECS, and the Donald and Mary Hyde Fellowship at Harvard University. Most of all, to my wife, Becky Waterfield.

Abstract.

A resurgence of interest precipitated by Joyce Hemlow in the middle half of the twentieth century has rescued the British novelist Frances Burney d'Arblay's (1752 – 1840) cutting social criticism from the shadow of her near-contemporary Jane Austen. Yet such work has – with the exception of recent work on the colonial contexts of the Burney family as a whole – centred on the standard gendered contexts of elite social spaces and marriage markets. Frances Burney, however, was the Anglican daughter of a Catholic mother, counted Burke, Garrick, Johnson, and Mrs Thrale among her friends after *Evelina*'s publication in 1778, spent five years as servant to Queen Charlotte, witnessing the Hastings Trial and George's first illness, then married a French Roman Catholic émigré and spent ten years trapped in France during the Napoleonic War. Her father, a musicologist and teacher, struggled to reconcile a conservative elite sociability with the quasi-proscribed Catholicism of his wider circle.

This thesis argues Frances' world view is deeply engaged with contemporary political philosophy. Her correspondence and romance plots work out the contradictions of performing a sectarian Anglican Womanhood which is both self-evidently artificial yet

supposedly innate, naturalising a brutal Protestant hegemony which condemns her family and friends. Her romance plots, centring on disputed inheritances and disrupted lineages, reflect her early reading of David Hume, and tacitly acknowledge Stuart rights while defending Hanoverian legitimacy on Humean grounds of peace and stability. If her early novels display a hope that contested identities can be reconciled, it does not survive exposure to the court. By the time of the French Revolution, after sectarian riots, and with royal illness raging, the emotional turmoil of the families in Burney's novels reflect a broken royal body, and a fractured landscape.

Declaration.

This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text.

It is not substantially the same as any that I have submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for a degree or diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text. I further state that no substantial part of my dissertation has already been submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for any such degree, diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text

It does not exceed the prescribed word limit for the relevant Degree Committee.

Some of the arguments of Chapter Two were previously published in JECS. For the definitive version, please consult:

Daniel Waterfield, '"My Brain is on fire!" Anglican Womanhood and the Limits of Politeness in Frances Burney's Cecilia', JECS, Vol. 41, Issue 1, March 2019, 49 – 66.

Table of Contents

Introduction

At the end of the eighteenth century, the economic and social penalties on English Catholic life had begun to ease. The Papists Act of 1778 (18 Geo III c60) had softened some of the worst penal laws of the Popery Act 1698 (11 Will III c4). Priests and Catholic schoolmasters were no longer hunted. Protestant relatives no longer enjoyed automatic supremacy over Catholic heirs. In exchange for an oath of allegiance in which the Pope's temporal and the Stuart's dynastic claims were renounced, English Catholics could once more inherit and purchase land. While the 1778 Papists Act passed without much disturbance however, 'attempts to widen it to Scotland in 1779' were much less successful.[1] In June 1780, London and Bath were wracked by the worst outbreak of anti-Catholic popular violence for decades. Lord George Gordon's Protestant Association had presented a petition to parliament demanding the Act's repeal. When it was dismissed out of hand, some '40,000 to 50,000 people […] gathered on London's St George's Fields.'[2] The riots ended only when the army killed at least 200 people and re-occupied the streets of London.

The novelist and diarist Frances Burney (1752 - 1840) was with her then-close friend Hester Thrale (1741 - 1821) in Bath when the riots broke out. Despite their Anglicanism, a newspaper notice falsely accusing Mr Thrale of Popery meant they considered themselves threatened.[3] Her letters home to her father the musicologist and composer Charles (1726 - 1814), alongside frantic familial concern, bear sympathetic witness to the sight of the 'poor persecuted' priest Charles Walmesley,[4] whom Burney recorded fleeing his blazing chapel.[5] Correspondence between Frances and her sister Susan (1755 - 1800) meanwhile express pointed sympathy towards the 'poor innocent people, who, because they are Catholics, can have no hope of redress.'[6] Their father was even more explicit. In a letter to his friend, the cleric and classicist Thomas Twining (1735 - 1804), he damned the 'outrages' committed by

[1] Jerry White, *London in the Eighteenth century: A Great and Monstrous Thing,* (London: Vintage, 2012), 534.
[2] Ian Haywood and John Seed, 'Introduction' in Ian Haywood and John Seed, eds. *The Gordon Riots,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 1-18, 1.
[3] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 136.
[4] Frances Burney to Dr Charles Burney, Friday Night, Bath, June 9th. In Frances Burney, *Journals and Letters.* Peter Sabor and Lars E Troide, eds. (London: Penguin, 2000), 164.
[5] Dom Aiden Bellenger, '"Superstitious enemies of the flesh?" The Variety of Benedictine Responses to the Enlightenment" in Nigel Aston, (ed), *Religious Change in Europe, 1650 – 1914: Essays for John McManners,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 149 – 160, 156 – 7.
[6] Susan Burney to Frances Burney, 8 – 12 June 1780, *Egerton MS 3691* f. 132 – 142, British Library.

Lord Gordon and his 'fanatics' and 'miscreants' and described how the Opera performers, because 'guilty of a religion and country different to the mad bull, John, sang and danced with the utmost fear and trembling.'[7]

It was not just their friends and colleagues who were under threat. Frances' fears for the family's safety were well-founded. Susan wrote that '30 foot guards with an ensign at their head marched into the street,' but instead of dispersing, the rioters:

> instead welcomed [them] with loud shouts & huzzas – The ensign made some speech to them – but I suppose he dared not oppose so many hundred people as were here assembled after a very short discourse with them, he turned round, & marched out of the street as he came into it, the Mob shouting & clapping the soldiers on their back as they passed & one of these even joined in the huzza. [8]

With the military unwilling to confront the rioters, the mob returned to their search for Papists. At first, Susan was nervous but unconcerned. They, after all, were Anglicans. Frances and Susan's late mother may have belonged to a Catholic family, but Charles' children were – he ensured - all scrupulously Protestant. Yet the Burney's Anglicanism belied their interconnectedness with Catholic patrons, friends, and tenants. Over the week, Mrs Reynolds came to warn them that 'Mr Drummond,' whose daughter Charles taught music, was 'expected to be attacked that night – because his wife & family are catholic.'[9] Then one of their tenants 'whose wife keeps a china shop in one of the houses belonging to my father, just at the back of ours' arrived, to report that they too were in danger. When Burney's stepmother asks why, he acknowledges they 'are papists.' Susan, however, reassures him that the Burneys 'are the last people who would wish you to be persecuted.' Nevertheless, when one of the mob denounced the Burneys as 'all three papists', their father was forced to 'g[e]t his hat & Huzza'd from the window [though] it went against me to hear him.' Much better, Charles must have thought, to cross one's fingers and shout a few slogans to save the family home.

[7] Charles Burney to Thomas Twining 11 June 1780 in Charles Burney *The Letters of Charles Burney, Vol 1, 1551 – 1784* ed by Alvaro Ribeiro, SJ (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 301 – 312, 302, 306.
[8] Susan Burney to Frances Burney, 8 – 12 June 1780, *Egerton MS 3691* f. 132 – 142, British Library.
[9] Ibid.

Charles therefore preserves his property rights by swearing an oath to a popular anti-Catholic sovereignty radically at odds with the Protestant government and his own family and friends. While it is impractical to fully explore the history of the Gordon Riots, it is striking that the mob's threats mirror the penalties only recently eased under the recent legislation.[10] The mob, in so doing, asserts a conception of property and loyalty that goes against the secular, ecumenical conception of identity that the easing of Penal Laws implied. The Burney family therefore found themselves at the centre of a struggle between popular and national identities, sovereignties, and loyalties as London burned. In turn, the riot's broad anti-Papist violence, its attempted fracturing of the polite social ties between Christian denominations that persisted through the Penal laws, and the language invoked of popular sovereignty and identity points to a multiplicity of, and tension between, conceptions of nation, religion, and identity in eighteenth-century London. This thesis examines this web. It finds a polite social and material fabric of competing and contradictory loyalties of family, friends, neighbours. All this however was uneasily predicated on fictions of nationhood and the uncertainty of the marketplace, the contradictions of which had to be constantly smoothed over, lest they point to the histories and identities at odds with the sociable and commercial identity on which Hanoverian legitimacy rested.

Existing histories of nationalism and Christianity in late 18th and early 19th century Britain have been characterized by their attempts to find a dominant ideology by which to identify the period and explain the development of British national identity. Meanwhile, scholarship on Frances Burney has, from the resurgence of interest in her work during the 1980s been mostly divorced from the rich, religious, and intellectual currents of her life. When some political engagement has been acknowledged, it has been to dismiss her as a reflexive and at times reactionary conservative, for whom it took ten years in France with her Catholic husband to liberalize. This is untenable. This thesis argues Burney's sympathy for Catholics was formative, familial, and foundational, and that she struggled to reconcile the cosmopolitanism of her transnational family life with the public demands of Anglican

[10] For an introduction to the topic, see: George Rudé, 'The Gordon Riots: a study of the rioters and their victims', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 6 (1956); George Rudé, *The Crowd in History: a Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England, 1730–1848* (London, 1964); Colin Haydon, 'The Gordon Riots in the English provinces', *Historical Research*, Vol.63, Issue 152 (October 1990), 354-359; Ian Haywood and John Seed, eds. *The Gordon Riots: Politics, Culture, and Insurrection in Late Eighteenth-Century Britain (*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

womanhood. Burney's awareness of the 'violence of the marketplace' and pining for the lost links between worth and birth which concern foundational Burney scholarship is, moreover, inextricable from the unsettled and quasi-gothic landscapes that haunt her last three novels. Burney's heroines are made and unmade by birth, capital, and family. Their encounters with impolite relatives and quasi-gothic families fictionalise Anglican hegemony's encounters with the Catholic and Stuart past. As they stumble through crumbling castles, disjointed cities, and past illegible monuments, Burney points to how Adam Smith's secularisation of value and sentiment are inextricable from theories of Hanoverian legitimacy. It is this deracination of bodies, families, lineages, and lands in favour of the whims of market value which haunt Burney's novels, as much as her growing awareness of its glass-like fragility. In other words, Burney argues that polite identity in the latter half of the long eighteenth century was at direct odds with a multitude of local histories and identities, all of which littered the land and families, and which belied Hanoverian claims to hegemonic natural progress. Like Hume and Johnson however, while unsettled by the violence of 1688 she acknowledged Hanoverian claims and deeply loved the Royal Family. But she also understood the Politeness instilled by the ubiquitous conduct books as anything but polite. These manuals for young women naturalised a sociable Hanoverian identity, Burney argued, at the expense of these lost histories and beloved families. Becoming an adult woman in polite company was the process of becoming British, of relinquishing – or being seen to relinquish – familial, local, and religious ties in favour of a moderate national British identity. Yet as Burney scholarship has already hinted, becoming a British Woman came at a profound psychological cost. The archetypical Anglican Woman as Burney represents it is a carrier of polite capital, who is both shaped by and yet expected to moderate the vicissitudes of the Smithian sociable marketplace, that is, the polite spaces in which social and economic credit could be ascertained and validated. Anglican Womanhood, then, as much as British national identity itself, make sense neither as a reified identity, but as a disparate set of techniques which Frances understood were taught to navigate families, friends, and polities' competing loyalties, and which, as Burney so powerfully understood, were inextricable from the threat of male violence.

Since the resurgence of interest in Frances Burney in the 1980s, scholars have sought to excavate Burney from the shadow of Jane Austen. Thanks in no small part to the work of Doody, Epstein, and Straub, almost every critic appears to agree on the proto-feminist nature of her work, its biographical foundations, and the resulting strength of her social criticism. Burney, this critical strand identifies, wrote in order to work through the violence by which patriarchal society subjected, controlled, and sought to shape late Georgian women.

Paradoxically, although such scholarship rightly identifies the context of a wider crisis of kinship and legitimacy, Burney is implied to be apolitical at best and reflexively conservative at worst. She is read as seeing only women qua women, and no further. To repeat, that is, a patriarchal gaze of separate spheres at the same time she bemoans its effects. Margaret Anne Doody set this tone by suggesting that Frances's novels reflect her obsession with her Catholic and European heritages and locates the origins of Frances' social concern with hearing tales of the penal laws and social persecution from her Roman Catholic grandmother.[11] All further mention of Catholicism then ceases. Julia Epstein's work similarly argues that the names of Burney's heroines are always 'unsettled and unsettling', her plots inextricably bound up with the search for a name and place in society, '[n]aming is never a simple process in these novels, tied as it is to the empowering social institutions of class, family, marriage, lineage and inheritance.'[12] '[S]urface propriety'- the sublimation of these competing identities under appropriate gendered behaviour - 'was purchased at the price of internal rage: that the cauldron was covered only made it boil with greater heat.'[13] Kristina Straub similarly sees Burney's work as an explicit commentary on the incoherence of a contemporary social ideology, 'contradictions that tend to leave disturbing rifts in the fabric of words.'[14] Like Epstein, Barbara Zonitch rightly argues for the centrality of violence to Burney's weltanschauung. Yet she suggests that Burney's 'preoccupation with violence

[11] Margaret Anne Doody *Frances Burney: The Life In the Works* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 100.
[12] Julia Epstein *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing* (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1989), 3.
[13] Epstein, 5.
[14] Kristina Straub, *Divided Fictions: Fanny Burney and Feminine Strategy* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1989), 2.

originates in the fear that the death of the aristocratic social denomination subjects women to the escalating violence of the modern world.'[15]

Leanne Manau atypically sketches the contribution Burney and her contemporaries made to the formation of national identity. Criticising Colley's downplaying of competing identities, she argues that Burney inter alia 'articulated their gender, rather than their national identities', and thereby 'took advantage' of nationalist politics to promote their 'gender politics.'[16]Although she rightly comments on the rarity of commentaries on Burney's approach to national identity, she unconvincingly concludes that a horror at Franco-British identity in *Evelina* and ambivalence about nationalist imagery is only reversed after her marriage to d'Arblay and a decade in France.[17] In an idiosyncratic treatment of Burney's novels, Brian McCrea argued that Burney invited both the 'Victorian men of letters' and feminist scholars in the 1980s to 'badly miss her', and instead suggests Burney remains 'decidedly non-political in her own mind.'[18] More interestingly however, McCrea argues for Burney's patriotism, but argues it was a kind that was decidedly English; 'she stands, as Linda Colley has described it, before the invention of Great Britain.'[19]

Yet work on kinship and the eighteenth-century novel suggests Burney's entangled plots were inextricable from contemporary debates on post-1688 social and political order. Ruth Perry argues eighteenth-century novels were obsessed with attempts to 'defin[e] family memberships' and relations, with the isolation of the heroine mirroring the social upheaval occasioned by a shift in kinship patterns away from ties of blood to those of affection.[20] Miranda Burgess proposed that this shift in kinship relations was reflective of a wider social disorder in the great chain of being caused by the revolution of 1688. The messy romance plots of eighteenth-century novels were relatively safe spaces in which to work through examples and situations that deviated from the post-revolutionary theories of monarchy and

[15] Barbara Zonitch, *Familiar Violence: Gender and Social Upheaval in the Novels of Frances Burney* (London: University of Delaware Press, 1997), 15.
[16] Leanne Maunu, *Women Writing the Nation: National Identity, Female Community, and the British French Connection, 1770 – 1820* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2007), 14-15, 17.
[17] Manau, 40-45.
[18] Brian McCrea, *Frances Burney and Narrative Prior to Ideology* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013), 2 – 3.
[19] McCrea, 9.
[20] Ruth Perry, *Novel Relations: The Transformation of Kinship in English Literature and Culture, 1748 – 1818* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 3, 30, 1.

family formulated by David Hume and Adam Smith.[21] Stuart legitimacy and consequently social order rested on a coherent and persuasive ideological foundation of divine right. Hanoverian supporters, on the other hand, consisted of a messy alliance of 'whigs, anti-Jacobite Tories, and disillusioned former Jacobites.'[22] With the social order disrupted by the Civil Wars and Glorious Revolution of the 17th century, Protestant writers needed to construct a coherent theory of constitutional monarchy to underpin the social hierarchy in the face of anarchy. Burgess argues that it was Locke's labour theory of value that provided this, and that it hinted that 'shared feeling holds the social fabric and its system of value together.'[23] Consequently, 'Britain's order' depended on 'heterosexual desire, which produces what the first treatise stipulates is the original division of labour, the first properly coherent and the earliest hierarchy of rank.'[24] Novels were exquisitely placed between 'political philosophy and the details of private life' and thus 'often tell stories of societies' formation and cohesion' and were understood as such by 'politicized readers'.[25] Burgess goes on to argue Burney's novels decry 'laissez-faire thinking about sexual and literary commerce, and its accompanying defensive nationalism' which in turn lead to 'the new-fangled tyranny of the marketplace.'[26] Like Zonitch then, she proposes Burney lamented the loss of 'the traditional Tory equation of worth with birth.'[27]

Yet this thesis suggests that such a straightforward lamentation would be incorrect. Her novels are full of lost inheritances, disrupted bloodlines, nameless orphans and heiresses whose entrances into the world are complicated and uncertain. The Burney family is similarly full of banished relatives, hushed Catholic relations, and children born out of wedlock whose names are unsettled and unsettling. Her uncertain familial identity and wide circle of correspondents, friends, and acquaintances are critical to understanding these plotlines. By reading the plotlines in terms of political and historical metaphor allows us to uncover a rich vein of engagement with contemporary debates. Frances Burney's novels and diaries reveal not just how families struggled to balance internal loyalties that transgressed the politeness – an economic, social, gendered, sectarian, and nationalistic discourse – demanded in the

[21] Miranda J Burgess, *British Fiction and the Production of Social Order, 1740 – 1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 18.
[22] Burgess, *British Fiction,* 19.
[23] Burgess, *British Fiction,* 50.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Burgess, 17.
[26] Burgess, *British Fiction,* 73.
[27] Ibid.

world, but how that politeness denied the subject's attachments at the very moment of performance. Burney's plots then, in which heroines are made and undone by their entrances into the world, their attempts root themselves to genealogy or detach themselves from the legal strictures of long-dead relatives and articulate their desires, return to the family as the counterweight to the national identity that struggled to impose itself on every facet of the world.

Burney and her contemporaries.

The Burneys counted a large circle of politicians, historians, theologians, royals, poets, and musicians among their friends. These connections are well documented. Yet their intellectual contribution to Frances' thought has been less well investigated. This section finds Frances at the centre of a thriving intellectual debate. Charles Burney's early years with Thomas Arne and Fulke Greville, his marriage to a woman from a Catholic merchant family, and his extensive network of Catholic friends and colleagues across Europe and England meant that from an early age, Frances would have been aware both of the violence of sectarian conflict, the vibrancy of theological debates, and – painfully – how these realities chafed against the enlightened detachment described by the conduct books. Voracious reading from Adam Smith and David Hume from her youth is reflected in her novels. So too can the influences of Samuel Johnson, Edmund Burke, and Elizabeth Montagu, all of whom visited her family home and corresponded with the family, alongside Hannah More and Mary Aspell. Yet while she draws on both Hume and Smith to criticise the market economy and Protestant historiography which she sees as dangerously repressing non-British identities, she cannot be easily cast as either a High Tory Jacobite or Radical dissenter. The genteel world of Burney's novels is pointedly fragile. Sexual and religious violence, psychosis, imprisonment, and the illegibility of the city are ever-present threats. This section suggests this represents her fear of the violence deployed and fomented by a polite market economy, and understood this to be at odds with the transnational networks of friends and family which she and her heroines were encouraged to repress. Yet this horror and precarity has to be balanced with her deep and abiding love for the Royal Family. Despite suffering for five years at court as a servant for

Queen Charlotte, an experience she describes as torturous, her love for the King, Queen, and Princesses only intensified. Yet as the King sickened, and the question of sovereignty arose again, so too did her fear of civil unrest.

The Burney family had come south from Scotland with James I in 1603. Charles' father James MacBurney, though educated at Westminster School, had been disinherited thanks to an imprudent marriage to an actress.[28] By the time Charles was born in 1726, the family had dropped the prefix. 'Scottish names,' Doody points out 'were not assets' in a society still reeling from Jacobite invasion.[29] Raised in Shrewsbury, Charles' musical talent had seen him apprenticed to the Catholic composer Charles Arne. Though enjoying a London soon to be in paroxysms of 'patriotic joy' over the defeat of the Jacobites,[30] by 1745 Charles had begun to chafe against his master. While J.C.H. Aveling points to Arne's faith, with the bulk of Charles' Catholic contacts made after his break with Arne, the lengths to which Arne went to slow Charles' learning and preserve the profit he generated offers a more suitable explanation.[31] Escape came thanks to Fulke Greville (1717 – 1806), who offered to buy him out of his apprenticeship 'almost at once.'[32] This would take almost two years, but Charles was permitted a short visit to Greville's seat in Wilbury, Wiltshire.[33] There, he met Samuel Crisp, just returned from Rome with the 'first large Pianoforte ever constructed', on which Burney's skill would further endear him to Greville's set. Crisp and Greville would together steer Burney's research towards France and Italy, on which he would focus for the rest of his life.[34] Just as important, however, was his apprenticeship into elite manners and society. His friendship with Crisp (whose assimilation into the family was such that he would be called – rather unsettlingly - 'Daddy Crisp' by Frances), was mirrored by the other members of the Wilbury set, some of whom would become lifelong friends and patrons.[35] Meanwhile,

[28] Roger Lonsdale, *Dr Charles Burney: A Literary Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 2.
[29] Doody, 11.
[30] Lonsdale, *Dr Charles Burney,* 12-13.
[31] J.C.H. Aveling, *The Handle and the Ax,* (Colchester: Bondd and Briggs, 1976), 291.
[32] Lonsdale, *Dr Charles Burney,* 18.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Joyce Hemlow, *The History of Fanny Burney* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), 3. Crisp would be called 'Daddy' by Frances.
[35] Hemlow notes the:

> lifelong friendship of Lady Crewe, Fulke Greville's daughter.; that of Garrick, the idol of their early years; that of the Earl of Holdernesse, under whose patronage young Charles was to enter the Charterhouse.
> Hemlow, *The History…*, 3.

Charles had met Esther Sleepe, the daughter of a London Catholic fan-making family. Charles' constant mention of her to Greville, who was preparing for a long journey in Europe, led Greville to jokingly ask why they weren't married. Greville found himself acting as a witness the next day.[36]

Left behind in London, Charles supported his young family through playing, teaching, translating and – thanks to David Garrick - composing.[37] By 1750 however, overwork had begun to take its toll. The resulting decade in Kings Lynn was by no means one of isolation from his role as mediator of European Catholic culture. Fertile friendships were formed with the Walpoles and Turners, the former of whose Houghton Hall he frequented,[38] By 1760 though, he had outgrown Lynn and, with the exception of his son James – who joined the Royal Navy on the verge of the Seven Years War– moved his family back to London.[39] With the death of his wife soon after came both severe depression and anxiety over his daughters' fate. Lacking dowries and therefore the possibility of elite marriage, the only path seemed to be employment as governesses. For this, however, they would need to improve their French. Charles therefore decided that would accompany his daughters to Paris before he set off on the tour of the continent derailed by his marriage to Esther.[40] While her younger sisters were sent to Madame Saintmard in Paris however, Frances was kept at home.[41] Kate Chisholm argues for Charles' fears that Frances' devotion to her Catholic grandmother would result in conversion, and the risk of instilling a prejudice for a religion other than their own would 'distract their mind, & if opposed, render them miserable for the rest of their lives.'[42] Frances' love for her grandmother extended therefore to her religion, and this in turn suggests an early ecumenicism in matters of family religion. Whether or not Frances here held the

---

[36] As Hemlow points out, they would have been in a hurry to marry – their first child Hetty had in fact been born the previous month. Hemlow, *The History…*, 6.

[37] Kate Chisholm, *Fanny Burney: Her Life* (London: Vintage, 1998), 8.

[38] Chisholm, 12.

[39]

> [H]e was signed up as Captain's servant on board the *Princess Amelia*. […] The Seven Years' War was at its height, and the *Princess Amelia* was on active service: the year James joined the crew, it formed part of Hawke's squadron in the Bay of Biscay and was almost blown up by French fireships in the Basque Roads the following year.
> Claire Harman, 20.

[40]

> Lady Clifford, sister of the Duchess of Norfolk. It is likely that Lady Clifford also provided financial assistance, since the cost of boarding the two girls, some £200 each year, was a substantial sum of money for Charles, who relied entirely on his own resources.
> Chisholm, 18.

[41] Kate Chisholm, *Fanny Burney: Her Life* (London: Vintage, 1998), 18

[42] Chisholm, 18.

seeds of Catholic belief as Charles feared, her father's efforts to avoid 'distract[ions]' and outright 'opposition' must be seen in terms of political and social utility and not reactionary anti-Catholicism. In other words, private sympathy was in tension with more public displays of allegiance that might jeopardise their tenuous social position.

Indeed, the continuing risks of Catholicism and Jacobitism would have been troubling for a man whose work depended on politically awkward friendships. While Charles was in Paris between June and July 1764, he had taken the opportunity to visit libraries and bookshops. He had also introduced himself to David Hume, who was acting as 'de facto secretary to the British Ambassador there, the Earl of Hertford.'[43] By the late 1760s, Charles' preliminary research for the *History of Music* had made it clear that a longer visit to the continent would be necessary. Such a visit would be expensive, but his remarriage to Elizabeth Allen in 1768 – who had inherited a large estate from her first husband – made it possible. 'No Englishman,' his biographer Roger Lonsdale points out, 'had previously attempted to write such a large scale History of Music, let alone cross Europe in search of materials.'[44] In order to gain access to the libraries and men of France and Italy however, Charles needed letters from his acquaintances and patrons 'to ambassadors and ministers from our court" in France and Italy.'[45] Yet Charles' circle was still small. Garrick as ever provided great use in introducing Charles to the circle he had met during his own visit to the continent through 1763-5, while the predominantly Italian musicians and composers Charles knew around Drury Lane and from his time in Norfolk were another source.[46] There were, of course, useful English friends – Dr Thomas Bever and Robert Hudson among them. Of Lonsdale's examples, however, the engraver Robert Strange is most interesting in illuminating the troubling proximity of Jacobite networks to Charles' own. Born in the Orkney Islands in 1721, Strange's early career was marked by his Jacobite connections. His wife's brother had been 'private secretary to James Francis Edward Stuart', and Robert had not only fought in

[43] James A. Harris, *Hume: An Intellectual Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 409.

> Lonsdale reports he was introduced to Hume thanks to the recommendation of Hertford via Michael Ramsay, who praised Burney as one of the 'most ingenious & deserving of musicians,' Burney also took the opportunity to deliver a political pamphlet by Greville to Hume. In true Burney style moreover, Hume would also go on to provide a letter of recommendation for a position in the King's band, though one of 'extra musician' and not Master, as he would have wished.
> Lonsdale, 62, 74-5.

[44] Lonsdale, 84.
[45] Lonsdale, 85.
[46] Ibid.

the ’45 but ‘designed Jacobite currency, and was with the Prince at Culloden’, while his engraving ‘of the prince […] became an important image in Jacobite propaganda in 1745–6. [47] Pardoned by the Act of Indemnity 1747 (21 Geo. 2), Strange married, fathered a daughter, and spent time in the Jacobite centre of Rouen before returning to London via Paris in 1750 where he struggled to rehabilitate his artistic reputation. Martin Hopkinson points out that his brother in law’s position with Prince James from 1757 – 68 required him to ‘dispel doubts’ about where his loyalties lay.[48] Yet while he sought to atone by dedicating prints to the widowed Princess of Wales, he continued to hedge his bets; not only was he acting as a dealer with his brother in law in Rome, but James III ‘stood godfather to his eldest son, James Charles Stuart Strange.’[49] When Allan Ramsay ‘asked strange to engrave his portraits of the price of Wales and of Lord Bute’ however Strange ‘refused politely,’ unwilling to offend either camp – only for his refusal to be understood as a decidedly political refusal, something which the Prince and Lord Bute were ‘determined never to forgive.’[50] The damage done, Strange left his wife in charge of his English business and retreated to Rome, returning to London in 1765, only to find his attempts to exhibit within the newly formed Society of Artists still hampered by Bute and George III.[51] Charles’ reliance on such men would have only underscored the danger of his scholarly networks being read as pointed statements of loyalty. The Burney’s social position was therefore doubly precarious. Charles’ income was dependent on aristocratic connections and their recommendations. Yet the scholarly work with which he hoped to move to a more certain elite social footing among this set depended on political and dynastic links which risked colouring his own loyalty to the state.

These dangers become even more apparent when we consider Charles’ explicit aims to revivify Protestant England with Catholic European culture. Setting off on 7th June 1770, Charles spent two weeks in the Royal Libraries of Paris, leaving next for Geneva, where he met Voltaire, before heading down to Italy. Writing in the introduction to his account *The Present State of Music in France and Italy,* (1771) Burney argues music in England ‘forms a considerable part of divine service in our churches [and] is essential to military discipline;

[47] Timothy Clayton, ‘Strange, Sir Robert (1721 – 1792) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* version: 17 September 2015, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/26638
[48] Martin Hopkinson, ‘Sir Robert Strange’ *Print Quarterly,* Vol. 25, No. 4 (December 2008), 408-423, 408.
[49] Clayton, *Strange.*
[50] Ibid.
[51] Ibid.

and the theatres would languish without it.'[52] Yet while in the rest of Europe music stagnates in comparison to the other arts, 'music still *lives* in Italy, while the other arts speak only a dead language.'[53] Burney therefore decides to 'allay my thirst of knowledge at the source, and take such draughts in Italy, as England cannot supply. It was there I determined to hear with my own ears, and to see with my own eyes; and, if possible, to hear and see nothing but music.'[54] Burney acknowledges the inextricability of music from the Anglican state and its exceptionalism, linking church, military, and culture. It, however, needs a fresh injection of music from Catholic countries, which – paradoxically considering his previous statement - he assures the reader is extricable from Popish tyranny.[55] Indeed, his promise to 'hear and see nothing but music' belies his multiple daily attendances at mass, where he took communion, and even at the solemn vows of a nun which he dismissed as a 'human sacrifice.'[56] Indeed, foreshadowing his daughter's pre-occupation with seeing and being seen, Charles argues that it is possible to 'hear' and 'see' French and Italian music outside of the Catholic liturgical frameworks for which they were created and that this is what his forthcoming *History* will do. Burney's *Present State* thus attempt to underscore Anglican exceptionalism by infusing it with music from Catholic countries. Indeed, he seeks to add the history of music to Anglican histories which see the post-Revolutionary British state as the apotheosis of Christian government. But it also mirrors his own deeper anxiety regarding Christian inheritance and how far an Anglican culture and state can borrow from Catholic history without becoming 'infected'.

The travelogue was a success; the first volume of the *History* even more so. In the run-up to Frances' publication of *Evelina* in 1778 he was to gain access to the literary set he had long craved, thanks to Dr Johnson and Mrs Thrale.[57] Mrs Thrale places her own introduction to Dr

[52] Charles Burney, *The Present State of Music in France and Italy; or, The Journal of a Tour Through Those Countries, Undertaken to Collect Materials for a General History of Music* (London: T. Becket and Co in the Strand, 1771), 5-6.
[53] Burney, *The Present State,* 2.
[54] Ibid.
[55] Indeed, Damien Mahiet argues for a trajectory in Charles' philosophy of music that begins with his experiences on the continent researching his History.
Damien Mahiet, 'Charles Burney; or, the Philosophical Misfortune of a Liberal Musician', *Eighteenth-Century Music* 10/1 (2013), 41–63, 62.
[56] Burney, *The Present State…* 19 – 20, 21.
[57] Dr Johnson, like Charles, was deeply intertwined with European Catholicism. His correspondence with Hester Thrale demonstrates how they both dined often with Catholic priests in the mid 1770s. Samuel Johnson to Hester Thrale, May – June 1776, *MS Hyde 1*, Houghton Library, Harvard,

Burney in 1776, when he was introduced by Dr Seward as a suitable instructor for her daughter Queeney. As Lonsdale suggests, Charles' timing was fortuitous; their previous music master had quarrelled and left, and a spot opened in a house now at the peak of its intellectual vivacity.[58] Soon, he was offered a stipend of £100, on the condition he dine and stay one night per week with a circle 'which included Garrick, Reynolds, Murphy, Seward, Boswell, James Harris, and many of the 'blue stocking' ladies, who frequently adorned Streatham.'[59] Charles seems to have been prized for the sociability and manners learned with Greville at Wilbury. But as both Lonsdale and Doody note, closer inspection by Mrs Thrale had chipped away at the veneer. Though she always found him 'intelligent, cheerful, and modest' she identifies an unpleasant tendency towards obsequiousness.[60] After his horror at her marriage in the 1780s to the Italian catholic Piozzi, she 'included him among the crowds of her detractors' in a satiric poem [with the line] "And pliant Burney bows from side to side."[61] Even at the height of his fame then, Charles was always too eager to prove his loyalty, too fearful of censure, and of his own religious and political loyalties being questioned. Although Frances considered this trip to Paris the beginnings of Charles' literary ambitions then, it was more likely that the idea had been germinating for some years.[62] While [her father's] life was never as orderly as F[rances] would have liked', her location of her father's literary ambitions in the mid 1760s nevertheless pointedly intersects with her own first literary attempts.[63] In turn, the Burney family and Frances' work must be read in the context of Charles' attempts to translate Catholic culture to Protestant England via Jacobite and Catholic connections, doing his utmost to prove his loyalty to the Hanoverian state.

It is a key argument of this thesis that Frances understood that arguments over the limits of acceptable religion, gender, and history cannot be unpicked. While Brian McCrea cites her eagerness to meet Dr Johnson inter alia to argue her 'extensive ground[ing] in eighteenth-century literature', he nevertheless rather bafflingly argues that Burney stands outside of

[58] Lonsdale, 228 – 9.
[59] Roger Lonsdale, *Dr Charles Burney: A Literary Biography* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1965), 234.
[60] Lonsdale, 230 – 1.
[61] Doody, 164.
[62] Charles claimed the early 1750s; he moreover did little scholarly work in the five years after he returned from Paris in 1764. The impetus seems to have been rekindled by a conversation held in Oxford, where he received an honorary Doctorate of Music in 1769. Lonsdale, 63.
[63] Ibid. Burney's first novelistic attempt was *The History of Caroline Evelyn,* of which *Evelina* is technically a sequel. It, along with much of her other juvenalia, was burned on her fifteenth birthday – 13 June 1767 – several months before her father's remarriage to Elizabeth Allen. Doody suggests a link between this early burning and her stepmother, with whom she struggled to live for several years. Doody, 34-7.

politics and ideology.[64] It is true that the voracious reading that began while her father was in France, and which was nourished from her father's and Samuel Crisp's libraries, included vast swathes of poetry and history. Chisholm, for example, notes how she worked 'with the same dogged determination and keen intelligence as [her father and brother] she taught herself French and Italian by reading Dante, Petrarch, and Voltaire in the original.'[65] Doody in turn points to how as a child she read Pitt's translation of the Aeneid, and learned long passages of Alexander Pope by heart.[66] Equally important were the conduct books. Her diaries are full of references to conduct book writers such as 'Fenelon, Madame De Genlis, Hannah More, and Mrs Chapone.'[67] This genre of advice literature 'attempted to resolve uncertainties about the position of women' in a society where class boundaries had suddenly become quasi-permeable.[68] As Claudia Marina Vessilli sums up, they recommend modesty, prudence, and decorum under an absolute subservience to their husband or father.[69] Such behaviour in turn was supposed to help guard the adolescent woman from the 'wolfish' social predatory behaviour of men.[70] Vessilli, indeed, argues that Cecilia itself must be read as a conduct book.[71] But an early diary entry by Burney in 1774 points to how these books saturated her early thought and writing.[72] Such texts then were as critical as Pope and Voltaire to the intellectual milieu in which Burney was raised. Moreover, since such texts are repeatedly referred to in her diaries, it can be logically assumed that they were encouraged by her father, and as such their lessons broadly reflected those he wished to impart as appropriate behaviour for a young woman circulating amongst her father's patrons and peers.

Yet as Hester Chapone demonstrates, these texts were as obsessed with learning how to read history and scripture as they were with navigating sociable spaces. The 'principles' on which Hester Chapone urged her correspondent 'to direct your conduct and fix your mind' were

[64] Brian McCrea *Frances Burney and Narrative Prior to Ideology* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013), 2 – 3.
[65] Chisholm, 19.
[66] Doody. 21.
[67] Hemlow, ''Fanny Burney and the courtesy books,' *PMLA*, Vol 65, No. 5 (Sep., 1950), 732 – 761, 732.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Claudia Marina Vessilli, *Cecilia tra I <<courtesy books>> e la Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (Rome: Edizioni dell'ateneo & bizzarri: 1979), 13
[70] Vessilli, 14.
[71] Ibid.
[72] Frances' journal entry of Wednesday September 29 1774 recounts at length how seriously her family took her joke that she intended to write a courtesy book for her family and friends at Samuel Crisp's house at Chesington. See Wednesday 29 1774, Lars E. Troide, ed. *The Early Journals and letters of Frances Burney*, Vol 2. (McGill-Queens University Press: Kingston and Montreal, 1990).

unsurprisingly explicitly religious: 'The only sure foundation of human virtue is religion.'[73] Chapone also clearly understood the role of history in scripture. In advising the reader not just to read the Old Testament, but to read them 'as an history, in a regular course, and keep the thread of it in your mind' Chapone reflects the unravelling of historical threads occasioned by 1688.[74] By 'keep[ing] the thread of it in your mind' in turn, she invites the reader to compare authorised histories and the behaviour of the government against biblical – or perhaps pre-Revolution – examples. How far is the court, in other words, ruling moderately, wisely, and in a true Christian fashion? This even lapses into explicit social commentary. Revolution breeds horror as she discusses the ease with which 'we are dazzled with false glory, and willingly give in to the delusion; for mighty conquests, like great conflagrations, have something of the sublime that pleases the imagination, tho' [they cause only] devastation and misery.' [75] Contemporary European history seems to have little nobility to it for Chapone, who goes on to describe the genocide of aboriginal Americans and repopulation via the slave trade as 'shocking barbarity', which appears innocent only if compared to the Spanish colonisation of South America.[76] Chapone's example points not just to the centrality of Anglican prudence to the debutante then, but sets out the historical and political implications of the constant re-reading in which the debutant is invited to participate. Mature social identity, Chapone argues, depends on recalling the brutality of colonial civilisation, and the failure of society to live up to religious virtue. Her debutantes then are young women whose place in an exceptionalist society is predicated upon understanding the contingency and subjectivity of the very historical narratives which underpin that world. Indeed, to speak politely for Chapone is to be constantly aware of that failure.

Burney's work problematised attempts to naturalise politeness. Hannah More claimed in one early work of 1777 that she 'by no means pretends to have composed a regular system of morals, or a finished plan of conduct' but only intends 'a few remarks' for young women about to enter the world.[77] These denials are somewhat belied by the preface to her *Sacred Dramas* five years later, in which she rather 'aspired after moral instruction, than the purity

[73] Hester Chapone, *Letters On The Improvement of the Mind* (Dublin: J. Exshaw, esq, 1773), 2.
[74] Chapone, 16.
[75] Chapone, 240.
[76] Chapone, 242-3.
[77] Hannah More, *Essays on Various Subjects, Principally Designed for Young Ladies* 5th ed. (London: T. Cadell, 1791), 2-3.

of dramatic composition' and avoiding 'acts' and 'scenes' she sought, as 'the sacred Historian' did, to 'represent[t] him as exhibiting no mean lesson of modesty, humility, courage, and piety: virtues not only admirable, but imitable; and within the reach of every reader.'[78] This language mirrors that of Burney's repeated derisive rejection of the novel, and description of *Camilla* as a 'new work', and 'sketches of characters and morals, put into action.'[79] Both More and Burney are not attempting to describe a checklist like 'regular system of morals' but rather a 'dramatic composition,' because both engage with the new façade of British national identity. J. Paul Hunter distinguishes novels from courtesy books by arguing that novels are 'rooted in epistemology' unlike 'conduct books and treatise on contemporary manners' they prompt the reader to 'transcend their context', novels pleasurably ask 'what would it be like to be' rather than 'what does one do when faced with' a particular context.[80] In other words, novels naturalise the explicit didacticism of the conduct books. They prompt the reader to internalise the historical judgement fundamental to Chapone, but in refraining from pointing out those deficiencies they naturalise Anglican exceptionalism. This, Burney argues, occasions profound psychological torment. Her heroines repeatedly find themselves in situations where the advice of the conduct books – and the psyches and bodies of the heroines - are stretched to breaking point, with slavery, madness, death, and suicide becoming ever more explicit. In this sense, then, Burney understands that the polite behaviour demanded of young women depends on not-seeing, and not-saying as much as they do a process of naturalising a moderate Anglicanism. It is this torment, this denial of what is evident, that terrorises Frances.

Adam Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments* and his description of post-revolutionary social order is clearly reflected in Frances' novels' preoccupations with politeness, sensibility, and an emergent market economy. In brief, Smith's *Moral Sentiments* argues that while the subservience of the monarch to the will of the people may be rational doctrine, it is in no sense natural.[81] Such natural social difference is almost insurmountable. Politeness is the language of power: and is almost ridiculous in its imitation by lower orders.[82] Since virtue

[78] Hannah More, *Sacred Dramas Chiefly Intended for Young Persons: The Subjects Taken From The Bible. To Which Is Added, SENSIBILITY, A POEM (Dublin: P. Byrne, 1784),* vi-vii.
[79] McCrea, 3.
[80] J. Paul Hunter, *Before Novels: The Cultural Contexts of Eighteenth-Century English Fiction* (New York & London: W.W. Norton, 1990), 44, 95. Hunter's discussion of the importance of religious guidance in the formation of the novel is also critical, see 265-6.
[81] Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (London: Penguin, 2009), 66.
[82] Smith, *Moral Sentiments,* 68.

and rank are not linked, this is particularly socially dangerous. It is only through socialisation and impartial reflection on this experience that one is able to learn to distinguish praiseworthiness.[83] Talking as if to one newly enriched, Smith accordingly counsels 'do not confine the enjoyment of your good fortune to your own house', but neither 'seek nor shun' the company of 'those who were once your superiors.'[84] Smith goes on to elide 'history and romance' and their 'the account of actions either of generosity or of baseness' to argue the horror or admiration we accordingly feel are the result of our own experience of similar actions.[85] As such, general rules for conduct can be deduced from observation, with divine order rooted by and reflecting the almighty's preference for testing one's morality in society rather than eschewing it in monkish seclusion. [86] Unsurprisingly for a text which rejects both puritan and Catholic seclusion, the memory of religious violence runs deep. Echoing Hester Chapone's disgust at the violence of empire building, he suggests 'both rebels and heretics are those unlucky persons who, when things have come to a certain degree of violence, have the misfortune to be of the weaker party.'[87] He is equally disgusted by 'faction and fanaticism', and suggests the truly 'impartial spectator' against which behaviour should be compared, would not 'impute all their own prejudices […] to the great judge of the universe.'[88] Smith, then, describes a sociable, self-regulating society in which moderate religion is inextricable from socialisation. Unsurprisingly, he suggests 'domestic education' is better than boarding schools for family unity, because the cri du sang 'the force of blood' by which affection between kin works beyond knowledge of those self-same relations 'exists nowhere but in tragedies and romances.'[89] It would be ridiculous, he points out, to imagine such a link between 'aunts and uncles' or cousins, because 'what is called affection, is in reality nothing but habitual sympathy.'[90] Smith therefore describes a post-revolutionary social order rooted in sociability, habit, and the invocation of an impartial observer. This naturally mirrors not only the advice given in the conduct books, but also finds expression in Burney's heroines' attempts to navigate the social gaze.

[83] Smith, *Moral Sentiments,* 176, 177.
[84] Ibid.
[85] Smith, *Moral Sentiments,* 184.
[86] Smith, ibid.
[87] Smith, *Moral Sentiments,* 179.
[88] Smith, *Moral Sentiments,* 179-80.
[89] Smith, *Moral Sentiments,* 262.
[90] Smith, *Moral Sentiments,* 260.

Burney understood that Smith's social and economic work is inextricably bound up. In *The Wealth of Nations,* he draws explicit parallels not only between prudent housekeeping and national spending, but ties moderate sociability with moderate spending in durable goods, urging the reader neither to spend nothing on hosting, nor on 'furniture, jewels, trinkets, and gewgaws.'[91] Bankruptcy is compared with the gallows as he seeks to define a 'natural order' to replace the great chain of being lost at the revolution.[92] When researchers discuss Burney's horror of the marketplace, then, her criticism of the shift in the economy must be – pace Smith – understood as inextricable from wider religious and historical debates. Discussions of luxury, bankruptcy, and commerce among women cannot be unpicked from wider questions of social order. Indeed, where Smith sees interdependence and progress under the law and liberty of restrained monarchy and parliament, Burney sees the encroachment of a social marketplace in which new values, meanings, and history are dangerously fragile. The ghosts of feudal families and estates, the realities of cross-border and cross-confessional families whose religious and social identities must be concealed and contextualised, all struggle to survive in a world where the long histories of recusant and even supposedly solidly loyalist families are reduced to habit, and their daughters to carriers of value.

It is no coincidence Evelina prepares for her entrance into a world that seeks to separate her from her 'impolite' grandmother, and long lost aristocratic father with a trip to a milliner where male shopkeepers seem to know dresses, garters, and underclothes better than women, or that the first place she risks being seen is the visual field of the theatre. Nor that in both *Evelina* and *Cecilia* that a cri du sang formally brings Evelina and her father together, and latterly, thanks to an Anglican heiress's unintended desires, threaten to destroy a recusant family who struggle against this social marketplace. The very geography of England, of country and town, are bound up – pace Smith – in the logic of the marketplace. Town and country are symbiotic, with 'the town a continual fair or market, to which the inhabitants of the country resort in order to exchange their rude for manufactured produce.'[93] Thus Burney's heroines enter the city to learn to become women, to navigate the streets as they navigate their own bodies. When they lose their capital, social or economic, the streets become illegible, and post-Reformation Anglican history no longer hangs together.

[91] Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations, Books I – III,* edited with introduction and notes by Adrian Skinner, (London: Penguin, 1999), 440-8.
[92] Smith, *Wealth of Nations,* 482-3.
[93] Smith, *Wealth of Nations,* 481.

Yet if Burney believes Smith's description of the new social order is accurate at the very time she laments it, the sceptical logic of her precarious loyalism reflects Smith's friend David Hume. In brief, David Hume's social theory was one of pragmatic cynicism. He rejects the idea of an original contract, not through a belief that the people have no democratic right, but because 'the original establishment was formed by violence, and submitted to by necessity.'[94] Regarding the Protestant Succession, he acknowledges the claims of the Stuarts 'the succession clear and undisputed, free from a pretender,' while troubled by heredity and Catholicism.[95] Yet since 'the settlement in the house of Hanover has actually taken place,' and 'the princes of that family, without intrigue, without cabal, without solicitation on their part, have been called to mount our throne, by the united voice of the whole legislative body' and crucially displayed moderation while doing so, Hume claims it would be ridiculous to thus change our minds by recourse to popular consent alone as the foundation of government.[96] Yet a more pressing reason for loyalty seems to be the violence of another 'civil war and rebellion.' Since the Hanoverians have been established 'in so long possession, secured by so many laws […] we should not, even by a revolution, obtain the end of avoiding a disputed title.'[97] Hanoverian legitimacy, as Burney understands, was an active process bound up with the passage of time and the proof of moderate rule: each polite conversation, each considered fashionable purchase, each act of social, historical, or cultural interpretation anchored both subject and king, man and woman, husband and wife under a new social order.

Nevertheless, the Constitutional via media in England between republicanism and autocratic monarchy is delicate in its novelty.[98] Like Smith, Hume believed that sociable exchange was inextricable from the commerce possible under free government. '[T]here is something hurtful to commerce in the very nature of absolute government […] not because it is less secure, but because it is less honorable.'[99] In a republic meanwhile, great wealth would translate to a power at odds with that of a monarch 'because he would infallibly have great authority in the government.'[100] But because Hume argues that national characteristics are

[94] David Hume, 'Of the Original Contract,' in David Hume, *Political Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 186 – 201, 186, 190, 192-3.
[95] David Hume, 'Of the Protestant Succession,' in Hume, *Political Essays,* 213-220, 216.
[96] Hume, 'Protestant Succession', 220.
[97] Ibid.
[98] David Hume, 'Of the Parties of Great Britain,' in Hume, *Political Essays,* 40 – 45, 40.
[99] David Hume, 'Of Civil Liberty', in Hume, *Political Essays,* 51-57, 55.
[100] David Hume, 'Whether the British Government Inclines More To An Absolute Monarchy, Or A Republic', in Hume, *Political Essays,* 28-32, 30.

based on habit and not on climate, the free exchange of ideas, association, and commerce possible are bound up with the liberties permitted by a limited monarchy such as Great Britain.[101] Since wealth and people circulate, thus vested interests and cliques do not tend to form which might challenge what remains a novely moderate status quo. As both Hume and Burney are so painfully aware however, this does not translate to stability. The popular consent which precipitated 1688 and risks permitting the people to change their mind is sublimated only by false historical narratives of reclamation of an ancient order. Hence while Hanoverian legitimacy rests on moderation in government, the 'popular party' in place claims to be recovering an 'ancient constitution.' This, both agree, is nonsensical at best and dangerous at worst. As Hume points out, 'the present prerogatives of the crown' date only to the Tudors.[102] Control over Kings were located in the Barons, not the commons. In 'ancient times [that] were more turbulent and seditious' there was little opportunity to gather the property the commons now view as fundamental to their legitimacy. It is law and moderate government only which underpin freedom. Pace Miranda Burgess then, Burney's heroines' preoccupation with precarity, death, illegible landscapes, rootless commerce, and terrifying spectres of Catholic pasts find their roots in her early reading of Humean precarity. Both identity the active process of Hanoverian legitimacy, which grows with every law and with every year of moderate rule that passes. It is no wonder that the spectre of Stuart legitimacy continues to haunt the psychogeography of England. Burney loved the Royal Family as much as she hated the sociable marketplace on which their reign found legitimacy for its potential for social disorder. Her sympathy for Catholic friends and family, and the nagging memories of Stuart legitimacy and the Catholic past were balanced by her knowledge, pace Hume and Smith, of the possibility of resurgent political violence. As such, Burney found the performance of polite sociability almost torturous. Julie Parks argues that Smith's self-regulation formed part of a wider trend towards metaphors of automation and artificiality that Burney understood as shaping the limits of female expression.[103] Yet as this thesis argues, Burney's repeated metaphors of artifice and automation only underscore the extent to which women's bodies were, in their embodiment of nation, religion, and history, the battlegrounds of Hanoverian supremacy.

[101] David Hume, 'Of National Characters,' in Hume, *Political Essays,* 78 – 92, 82.
[102] David Hume, 'Of the Coalition of Parties', in Hume, *Political Essays,* 206 – 212, 208-12.
[103] Julie Park, 'Pains and Pleasures of the Automaton: Frances Burney's Mechanics of Coming Out', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Fall, 2006), 23-49, 25.

The period surrounding Evelina's composition and publication coincided with the family's entrenchment among the Streatham set, and the equally formative influences of Samuel Johnson, Hester Thrale, Edmund Burke, and David Garrick. All these figures shared a lingering acknowledgement of Stuart legitimacy, and this milieu demonstrates the extent to which Frances' writing was immersed in dangerous debates over sovereignty.

Burney's disagreements with Edmund Burke are perhaps the most indicative. Both shared a broad latitudinarianism. Frances' otherwise puzzling opposition to the Hastings Trial then must be seen in light of their more fundamental disagreement with the concept of an ancient constitution., Burney disagreed with Burke's prosecution of Hastings not because she believed Hastings innocent, but because it reflected a continued attempt to impose a standard of behaviour which legitimised a constitution in which Burke believed and Burney and Hume questioned. While Burke was more explicit in his engagement then, both were equally driven by the same intellectual questions and engaged in the same wider conversation.

Indeed, the Burney family home can be theorised alongside the salons of the Bluestockings and the Streatham set as a space in which questions of national difference can be worked through after European sojourns. As with Hume and Smith, Montagu, Burney, and Thrale were in broad agreement on the benefits of Protestantism for British government. The difference was where the limits lay. This appears to underscore the broad religious character of the British state. Yet such broad agreement hides disparate attitudes to the Stuart past and Catholic friends, and remnants. During their visit to the continent in 1775 for example, Johnson and Thrale had enjoyed the company of educated Catholic clergy while debating the correct levels of reverence to be shown to the host in a Catholic mass.[104] Samuel Johnson, J.C.D Clarke suggests by pointing to his refusal to subscribe to the Oaths of Allegiance, may have once been close to converting to Catholicism and was certainly doubtful of Hanoverian legitimacy.[105] But – Thrale noted in 1777 shortly before they were introduced to Frances - since the failure of the '45 and fracturing of the Stuart cause, Johnson had become firmly

[104] Caroline Franklin, 'A Land of Slavery and Superstition'? Hester Thrale and Elizabeth Montagu in France', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 114, No. 2 (April 2019), 212-229, 217 – 8.
[105] J.C.D. Clark, "Religious Affiliation and Dynastic Allegiance in Eighteenth-Century England: Edmund Burke, Thomas Paine and Samuel Johnson", *ELH*, Vol. 64, No. 4, Jacobitism and Eighteenth-Century English Literature (Winter, 1997), 1029-1067, 1053.

attached to the present royals.[106] Elizabeth Montagu meanwhile, perhaps due to her lower social position, used her travelogue to repeatedly emphasise her own Englishness, and the supremacy of English moderation over French excess politeness.[107] Emma Major goes on to argue that this Englishness rather than Britishness underscores the need to explore the competing nationalities that were brought together under Britishness. [108] Not only did Charles Burney attend mass repeatedly on the continent, he formed working friendships with leading Catholic historians, such as Fr Martini, who was both a Franciscan friar and a leading musician.[109] Franklin's argument that the salons run by Thrale and Montagu represented transnational spaces in which national differences could be discussed and analysed. Charles Burney's home in turn must be seen in this context, and indeed his own relatively low social status when compared even to Montagu suggests that we should read his and his family's attempts to underscore their own conservative social identity in terms of Montagu's need to shore up her claims to Englishness. In other words, Burney family conservative statements should not be seen as reactionary but rather as further evidence of the tensions inherent in a European family with dangerous sympathies and unsettling friendships. Frances' early writing must be seen in this fraught context.

The Burney family's focus on public vs private performance of identity in turn problematise any real distinction between high and low church in Frances' ecclesiology. Burney, indeed, says very little about her personal beliefs, beyond implying tolerance and decrying sectarianism. Her time at court, to which she was sent after a failed attempt to arrange her marriage to the Cambridges, underscores her understanding of national and familial identity as inextricable, and the question of choice under Anglicanism as redundant. Yet if Queen Charlotte's representation of her circle affected an Astell-like Protestant convent or coterie, Burney's experience here led her to reject the possibility of female solidarity under the male violence which saturated society. In journals, diaries, and letters which repeat the tropes of monastic immuration, and dramas which only more explicitly state the lessons of her novels, she finds no freedom from the patriarchal gaze at court. Indeed, as she hinted at in the communal silence of Evelina's women under Captain Mirvan, the surveillance of social

[106] Ibid, 1055.
[107] Emma Major, 'Femininity and National Identity: Elizabeth Montagu's Trip to France', *ELH*, Volume 72, Number 4, (Winter 2005), 901-918, 910-11.
[108] Ibid.
[109] Howard Brofsky, 'Doctor Burney and Padre Martini: Writing a General History of Music', *The Musical Quarterly*, Vol. 65, No. 3 (Jul. 1979), 313-345, 316-7.

identity is quite self-sustaining. Moreover, even though the court was almost explicit in its acknowledgement of the constructed nature of a courtly familial identity to acted as sociable models for the country, Frances discovered that this resulted only in both extreme rigidity and fear. First at the closeness of inspection and rigidity of court ritual and then, after an assassination attempt on the king and the start of his illness, at repeated proofs of the fragility of Hanoverian life. Burney then cannot be compared easily to the high church proto-feminists like Mary Astell.[110] Nor to Wollstonecraft, for whom the answer to the socially constructed nature of womanhood lay in male emulation. As Burney understood, all gender relations were disrupted by 1688, all bound up with illegible conceptions of market value. *Camilla*, with its explicit comparison of women's beauty and their economic value, intriguingly conflates female and enslaved bodies as carriers of value in the racialised patriarchal marketplace. For Burney, the new social order's instability only invited the reification of difference at best, and Jacobin terror at worst. Only refuge within the family and under the King, a conservatism of still ecumenical pragmatism best typified in *The Wanderer* (1814) offered limited protection from the violence without.

Nationalism.

This thesis therefore argues that a close reading of Frances Burney's life and work disrupts coherent ideas of national identity in the latter half of the British long eighteenth century. Despite this thesis' title, neither Anglican nor Womanhood can be abstracted from their embodiment. Gender, commerce, politeness, religion, and sovereignty were inextricably bound up, and individual treatment of one risks sublimating the others. In turn, while this thesis discusses an Anglican state after the Seven Years War, broadly focussing on George III after the loss of the American Colonies and up to the end of the Napoleonic Wars, the discrete boundaries and concepts implied here should not detract from the fundamental fuzziness and fragility of social relations in the period after 1688. Other histories, identities,

[110] See: Robert M. Andrews, "Women of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century High Church Tradition: A Biographical and Historiographical Exploration of a Forgotten Phenomenon in Anglican History", *Anglican and Episcopal History*, Vol. 84, No. 1 (March 2015), 49-64.

Christianities, and genders were – as Burney repeatedly underscores – continually threatening to break through the indifferent supremacy of politeness.

In order to see this, it is worth briefly considering the historiography of British national identity. Whig historians of the nineteenth century such as Thomas Babington Macauley generally portrayed the eighteenth century where the gains of the English Civil War and revolutions of 1688-9 were crystallised, and Britain was established on its path to success in finance and empire. This was punctured most decisively in the interwar period by Butterfield and Namier. Namierite history i.e that of Lewis Namier and his followers, as Frank O'Gorman pointed out, 'stressed the importance of material and practical influences upon politics in the past' and the importance of individuals against what he perceived as the ideological fixation of whiggish narratives of progress.[111] Butterfield similarly 'denounc[ed] the whig interpretation.'[112] However, while Namier was, for Keith Sewell, driven by a psychoanalytic weltanschauung where the great figures blundered in their blind absurdities, Butterfield's robust Augustinian theology drove an interpretation of history that was fundamentally tragic.[113] Meanwhile, the 1960s and E.P Thompson, George Rudé and Eric Hobsbawm inter alia shifted away from Parliament and towards social history. The 1980s in turn saw a return to the question of the importance of politics and parliament, with what O'Gorman terms a revisionist school arguing again for the importance of religious and dynastic considerations over and above straightforward economic conditions. It is from this revisionist milieu that Clark argues that the British state from 1688 – 1832, what he termed the *ancien regime*, defined itself in Anglican, confessional terms against anti-Trinitarians.[114] Linda Colley built on this and stressed how a reflexive and Francophobic anti-popery enabled otherwise disparate local identities to claim a transcendent unifying identity as 'Britons.'[115] This was indebted to Gerald Newman's argument that French influence had been critical to the formation of English identity.[116] Criticisms of both Clark and Colley have been numerous. Jeremy Black argues that both Colley and Clark underplayed the divisive nature of

[111] Frank O'Gorman, *The Long Eighteenth-Century: British Political and Social History 1688-1832* (London: Hodder, 1997), x
[112] E.H Carr, *What Is History?* (London: Penguin, 1990), 41.
[113] Keith Sewell, *Herbert Butterfield and His Interpretation of History* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 181-2.
[114] Jonathan Clark, *English Society, 1688 – 1832,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 8, 137.
[115] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707 – 1837* (London: Vintage, 1992), 5 – 8, 26.
[116] John Richard Moores, *Representations of France in English Satirical Prints, 1740 – 1832* (Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2015), 21.

religion in England.[117] Many others, as Moores goes on to list, have pointed out the pan-European identity fostered by Protestantism problematizes Colley's emphasis on its use as unifying, national force.[118] It is worth making a brief note about the distinction between the terms British and English. As Paul Langford suggests, "Englishness is a relatively modern invention" dating to "no earlier than 1805" and probably attributable to William Taylor, who popularised German Romanticism.[119] Emma Major on the other hand, points to Elizabeth Montagu's travelogues whereby she refers to herself as a Englishwoman, rather than Britishwoman to argue that 'eighteenth-century notions of Englishness often rely tacitly upon the supposedly "savage" traits of the Celtic countries to purify the [England's] civilization.'[120] 'Montagu's correspondence," Major argues, demonstrates 'how English, British, and Celtic national identities are written over one another, producing a palimpsest effect.'[121] This interlacing is a key point for this thesis, one underscored by Hobsbawm in the mid-1980s. 'Men and women,' he pointed out, 'do not choose collective identification as they chose shoes,' multiple attachments and loyalties may be held simultaneously, with one prioritised over the other in certain situations[122] It 'was only when one of these loyalties conflicted directly with another or others that a problem of choosing between them arose.'[123] Benedict Anderson, meanwhile, suggested that the nation was an "imagined community" composed of individuals who, though they never meet, nevertheless hold in their mind "the image of their communion" via the novel and the newspaper, which allows mutual intelligibility and recognition - he claims - between speakers of various Englishes, Frenches, and Spanishes.[124] 'Print language,' he therefore contends, 'invents nationalism.'[125] Adrian Hastings complicates this, arguing that the secular, modernist tendency in the history of nationalism proposed by Breuilly, Gellner, Hobsbarm, and Anderson that locates the origins of the nation state in the eighteenth century is overly simplistic.[126] Ethnicity, religion, nations,

[117] Jeremy Black 'Confessional State or Elect Nation?: Religion and Identity in Eighteenth-Century England' in Tony Claydon and Ian McBride (Eds.) *Protestantism and National Identity*: *Britain and Ireland, c1650 – 1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 52 – 74, 55.
[118] Moores, *Representations*, 22.
[119] Paul Langford, *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character 1650 - 1850* (Oxford: OUP, 2000), 1.
[120] Emma Major, 'Femininity and National identity: Elizabeth Montagu's trip to France', *ELH*, Volume 72, Number 4, (Winter 2005), 901-918, 901-2.
[121] Ibid.
[122] Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780, second edition,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). 123.
[123] Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism*, 123-4.
[124] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 2006), 4 - 6, 25, 44.
[125] Anderson, 134.
[126] Adrian Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion, and Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 1 - 6.

and nationalism he contends, are inextricably bound up. Ethnicities turn into nations when 'along with the pressures of the state' a vernacular is regularly employed for the translation of the Bible as such late sixteenth-century England provides the model for nations elsewhere.[127] While agreeing with Colley that identities were 'not like hats', Englishness and Britishness in this conception are not separable in the same way as British and Scottish or British and Irish.[128] Hastings therefore prioritises religion, shifts the origins of the British state back several hundred years, and re-asserts Colley's 'many hats' theory. Particularly appropriate for this thesis, considering the global connections which mark the Burney family, is C.A Bayly's concept of archaic globalisation. In brief, Bayly argued that in contrast to the historians of nationalism seen above, nations in the modern conception must be seen as a post-revolutionary, nineteenth century concept towards centralisation, uniformity, and "scientific" ideas of biological racial difference.[129] In contrast, the ancien regime was ethnically complex, characterised by a caste system of lineage, kinship, and purity, and still dominated by agrarian economics.[130] Authority was dispersed, and monarchical attempts at centralisation were limited in their success, and always dependent on negotiation with other competing authority in 'their' domains.[131] Renaud Morieux's work on the communities on both sides of The Channel and their resistance to territorial consolidation and explicit loyalties of the French Revolutionary Wars meanwhile further demonstrates Bayly's idea of 'archaic globalisation' and decentralisation. In other words, that the emergent identity of the centralised state had to work to impose its identity on other, local identities, every step of the way. This thesis' identification of insurgent market economics with Hanoverian legitimacy is inextricable from this, implying as it does not only that parliament, market, and religion were inextricably bound up, but that the rupture of 1688 marked in a real sense the beginning of the end of archaic globalisation and the ancien regime.

This understanding of the contingency and contestability of the expression of identity and nationality is important in understanding the totalising claims of the state which Burney identifies. Andreas Fahrmeir, tracking the history of citizenship and its reification in the wake of the French Revolutionary wars similarly acknowledges how 'dimensions of citizenship

[127] Hastings, 10-12.
[128] Hastings, 64
[129] C.A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World: 1780 - 1914* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 20, 47, 110.
[130] Bayly, 46.
[131] Bayly, 33.

rights were (and continue to be) available to different groups which overlap with the community of formal citizens only in part.'[132] The explosion of legislation identified by Terry Castle and David Lemmings that accompanied Hanoverian ascendency, and which sought to clean away folk custom in favour of centralised authority must therefore be seen in this context of Bayly's work on the challenges of the ancien regime state.[133] Such ability to express different identities in different contexts has also been used as a central argument for Dror Wahrman's work on what he claims was an 'ancien regime' of identity, one in which a 'unfixed and potentially changeable […] sheddable, replaceable, or mouldable' which began to give way in the wake of the American War of Independence to a modern, discrete, and immutable essentialism.[134] This thesis, however, suggests that this is not the case - at least not as Wahrman understood it. Rather, these categories continued to be in flux even as the boundaries between them became ever more rigidly policed and the dangers of failing to perform the right identity at the right time intensified as the process of nation building continued. In other words, Montagu's repeated identification as an Englishwoman is the other side of Burney's disrupted inheritances and unsettling names: identity was still up for grabs, and by looking for a discrete 'Britishness' or 'Englishness', we do the work of creation Burney problematised in the very act of researching the boundaries of national identity. More broadly, this thesis returns to Clark and Colley's prioritisation of the religious and sectarian focus of the ancien regime state, even as it invokes Bayly, Hobsbawm to suggest that the 'ancien regime' state as we understand it was fundamentally novel after 1688 and not the Wars of Independence. Indeed, Rogers Brubaker suggests that nations and ethnicities are more useful categories of reference than descriptive realities.[135] Invoking EP Thompson, he suggests that such categories are active, contingent, and procedural - they make - or fail to make - themselves rather than independently exist as groups.[136] This is an error that we must avoid: British national identity and Anglican Womanhood were broad and inseparable attempts at instilling loyalty and stability against the rupture of 1688, and not descriptions of

[132] Andreas Fahrmeir, *Citizenship: The Rise and Fall of a Modern Concept* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007), 2-3.
[133] Terry Castle, *Masquerade and Civilisation: The Carnivalesque in Eighteenth-Century Fiction* (London: Methuen, 1986), 100;
David Lemmings, *Law and Government in England During the Long 18th Century: From Consent to Command* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011), 1- 2.
[134] Dror Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004), 168.
[135] Rogers Brubaker, *Ethnicity Without Groups* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 13-15.
[136] Rogers Brubaker, "Ethnicity Without Groups", *European Journal of Sociology / Archives Européennes de Sociologie / Europäisches Archiv für Soziologie,* Vol. 43, No. 2, Études critiques (2002),163-189. 170.

existing categories. C.A Bayly's overarching argument was that modern ideas of the 'state, the nation, the "ethnic minority," science and the professions, emerged out of, or were to be imposed, on the more shifting, ideologically complex, yet economically simple world that preceded it.'[137] That is the work which Burney identified as being carried out, whether or not it was directed as such. In other words, I characterise the Hanoverian state as Anglican not because that accurately reflects a coherent ontological reality of something akin to a post-Industrial modern state. Rather, national identities in the latter half of the long eighteenth century in Britain are inextricable from the polite and commercial exchanges which underpin Hanoverian legitimacy. To say that the Anglican state positions itself against such a thing as French Catholicism or anti-Trinitarianism belies the extent to which polite exchanges of certain sections of non-aristocratic, non-pauper, society were inextricable from 'proving' Hanoverian popular sovereignty at the very same time that behaviour sublimated other identities. In other words, polite behaviour was Anglican, and Anglican was polite, and the act of being polite worked to naturalise certain ideas of natural identity, religious organisation, and royal history distinct from the preferences of its performer.

Anglicanism and Catholicism in the long eighteenth century.

The historiography of Christianities in England between 1688 and 1832 is formidable. It is understandably inextricable from wider histories of the European Reformation and histories of the nation. As such, a succinct precis is difficult. Nevertheless, this section argues that the history of religion in eighteenth-century England, and especially the definition of Anglican and Catholic identities - so critical to historians of British nationalism - must again be seen as contextual behaviours, as much ritual and local, proxies for debates over Royal power, as straightforwardly theological categories. Anglicanism and Catholicism, this thesis argues, are only tangentially related to Conformity and Jacobitism, and must not be read as coherent or indeed essential identities outside of particular instances. The Anglicanism of the conduct

[137] Bayly, 36.

books sat at painful odds, Burney understood, with the realities of theological debate and the struggles over communion and the boundaries of the established church. Sociable identity was bound up with a way of speaking and polite commerce which, this thesis argues, sought to remake oral and material cultures that provided dangerous possibilities for dissent. In turn, this troubled family identities in which inheritance of goods, affections, descent, and ways of speaking all held the possibility of being at odds with a loyalist politeness. Burney's novels then point to the difficulties inherent in discussing the history of eighteenth-century religion, in which religious, familial, and economic debates are inextricable.

Discussions of eighteenth-century Anglicanism are inextricable from the debates over legitimacy after 1688. One scholarly tradition, epitomised by J.C.D. Clark, argue the James II was deposed in favour of William and Mary for 'overwhelmingly religious reasons,' while others see it as the 'partisan triumph of the Whigs.'[138] Steven Pincus by contrast suggests both traditions are too fixated on the question of religion, and identifies widespread and enduring support for the Catholic monarch, from accession, elections, and Monmouth's failed rebellion.[139] James II's reign in his view was an attempt to remake English political life as distinctly French, Catholic, and autocratic. The revolution of William and Mary was in turn 'violent, modern, and decisive,' a break both with James II and the early modern state which he had sought to reform.[140] The consolidation of Protestant rule brought anxieties of legitimacy, confession, and consolidation. The assassination plot of 1689 was a focal point over what, exactly, constituted royal legitimacy and for Pincus this further underscores the revolutionary essence of 1688.[141] The extent to which British society underwent profound reform meanwhile cannot be separated from the threat of Catholic counter-revolution from the exiled Stuart court, whether through assassination plot, the French planned invasion of Scotland in 1708, or the Jacobite risings of 1715 and 1745. Despite William's supporters attempts to claim the language of de jure divine right, post 1688 rule was increasingly parliamentary, a dialogue between monarch and people codified by statute and law.[142]

[138] Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), 92-3.
[139] Pincus, *1688*, 94
[140] Pincus, *1688*, 8.
[141] Pincus, *1688*, 450.
[142] Adrian Streete, *Apocalypse and Anti-Catholicism in Seventeenth-Century English Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 248-9; see also Colin Haydon, *Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth-Century England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993) and Colin Haydon 'I love my king and my country, but a Roman Catholic I hate: Anti-Catholicism, Xenophobia and National Identity in Eighteenth-Century

Pincus' assessment therefore mirrors Hume and Smith, who prioritise dialogue, fragility, the legal system, and the proof of moderate governance in their discussions of the Hanoverian Anglican state.

This Anglican state, this mainstream argument continues, sought to define itself as anti-Catholic. As Linda Colley summarises, 'the chief curbs on Catholic civil rights were the Corporation Act of 1663 [and] the Test Act of 1673' both of which mandated taking Anglican communion and repudiating transubstantiation for most government offices, while Acts of 1678, 1689, and 1701 excluded Catholics from parliament and crown.[143] Whether or not religious difference drove 1688 or not, or the degree to which Jacobitism and Catholicism were linked or not, a wave of anti-Catholic rhetoric and Anglican supremacist policy informed the English and then British state, in Colley's eyes, until the Battle of Culloden ended the '45.[144] The history of, and attempts to define, Anglicanism in the long eighteenth century is therefore indebted both to the question of 1688 and also the degree to which Catholics and dissenters were to be excluded from a body politic of unsettled legitimacy.

There is therefore broad scholarly agreement on the conflation of religious dissent and wider state subversion. J.C.D. Clark reading of the eighteenth-century state was primarily confessional, with anti-trinitarianism inextricable from socio-political dissent.[145] James Bradley counters this by pointing to the dependable support dissenters gave to the government before the accession of George III. [146] As William Cornwall and Robert Ingram point out, however, the debate between Clark and Bradley over the degree to which the state could tolerate religious and political pluralism (and what distinction exists between the two) has focussed overwhelmingly on the structure of those religions and their encounters and less on the inner experience of what those religion meant to the people in question.[147] For Peter Nockles the broad consensus is that church-party controversy post 1688 was replaced after

England.' in Tony Claydon and Ian McBride (Eds.) *Protestantism and National Identity*: *Britain and Ireland, c1650 – 1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 33 – 52.

[143] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707 - 1837* (London: Vintage, 1996), 344.

[144] Pincus points to Catholic Williamites and Protestant Jacobites. Pincus, *1688,* 138; Colley, *Britons,* 344.

[145] Jonathan Clark, *English Society 1688 – 1832,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 8, 137.

[146] James E Bradley, *Nonconformity in Eighteenth-Century English Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), xii,

[147] William Gibson and Robert G Ingram 'Introduction' in William Gibson and Robert G Ingram (eds) *Religious Identities in Britain, 1600 -1832* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 1 – 9 , 3; Robert Cornwall 'Charles Leslie and the Political Implications of Theology' in William Gibson and Robert G Ingram (eds), *Religious Identities in Britain, 1600 -1832* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 27 – 42. 27.

George I's accession by 'a mid-century Anglican consensus built on the ideal of moderation and unity, and the non-partisan nature of much churchmanship in the period.'[148] Nockles argues that by the 1770s and the American Revolution, this internal cohesion had begun to fail, with only the Jacobin threat of the 1790s binding evangelicals to the church hierarchy.[149] Nevertheless, while the relationship between Anglicanism, Protestant Europe, and English dissent remains fraught, Anglicanism's self-representation in the eighteenth century remains relatively clear.[150] Anglicanism presented itself – ie in the conduct literature - as rational and moderate, in thrall neither to the puritan enthusiasm that had wracked the state in the previous century, nor to popish superstition, tyranny, and extravagance.[151] It was, in some Anglican imagination at least, elided with enlightenment progress – at least when compared to Catholic states.[152] As Emma Major points out, the preface to the 1662 edition of the Book of Common Prayer asserts that the foundational 'wisdom' of the Church of England since her first printed liturgy was 'to keep the mean between the two extremes, of two much stiffness in refusing, and too much easiness in admitting, any variation from it.'[153] If histories of the British state in this period search for an neat conception of 'British national identity', then while histories of British Christianities repeat some errors in reifying religious belief into a broad coherent and uniform idea in their practitioners, then they at least broadly recognise the procedural, mediated character of Anglican belief(s).

---

[148] Peter B Nockles, 'The Waning of Protestant Unity and Waxing of Anti-Catholicism?' Archdeacon Danbury and the Reconstruction of 'Anglican' Identity in the Later Georgian Church, 1780 – 1830.' In William Gibson and Robert G Ingram, 179 – 230, 179 – 80;
For more on the fractious nature of English Protestant identity as it relates to the Anglican Church, see: Justin Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies 1660–1730* (Cambridge, 1992); Andrew Starkie, *The Birth of the Modern Church of England: The Bangorian Controversy*, 1716–1721 (Woodbridge, 2007).
[149] Nockles, 193.
[150] On the relationship between Anglicanism and Protestant Europe and the Hanoverian dimension see, for example, Andrew C Thompson 'The Confessional Dimension', in Brendan Simms and Torsten Riotte (eds.) *The Hanoverian Dimension in British History, 1714 – 1837* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 161 – 182, 169 – 70, 179, 180.
[151] Keith Thomas argued belief in the active supernatural (witches, ghosts, monsters) was a hallmark of Catholic belief in Anglican thought for much of the early Reformation. Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic,* (London: Penguin, 1971), 598. Francis Young however asserts the fundamental Englishness of Catholics in their beliefs by the eighteenth century, while underscoring the use of 'popish' as a synonym for un-Christian superstition, pointing especially to the Whig Churchman Francis Hutchinson's *Essay Concerning Witchcraft* of 1718's argument that anti-Witchcraft legislation was attributable to a Catholic past. By the latter half of the eighteenth century, Young suggests it was 'enthusiastic' dissenters who were thought to be superstitious. Francis Young, *English Catholics and the Supernatural, 1553 – 1829* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 2, 163-4.
[152] Colin Haydon *Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth-century England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), 6.
[153] Emma Major, *Madam Britannia: Women, Church, and Nation, 1712 – 1812* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 32-3.

The polite sociability of the late Anglican state appeared to offer an olive branch to recusant families willing to at least offer lip service to the new regime. As Geremy Carnes has argued, the history of the Catholic Church in England after 1688 has only recently began to be unpicked from a whiggish notion of decline, Jacobite loyalism, and 'detachment from political life.'[154] This tendency is best summed up by Thomas Babington Macauley's description of Catholics as dwelling in 'semi-feudal simplicity', who sometimes apostatized for political reasons, but who largely bore meekly the oft-ignored Penal acts under a secularising, tolerant, Hanoverian regime.[155] This began to change in the wake of the Second Vatican Council, and in particular the work of Eamon Duffy, John Bossy and J.C.H. Aveling.[156] Bossy pointed out that rather than a period of steady decline, the Catholic population in fact grew during the eighteenth century.[157] J.C.H. Aveling meanwhile argued that the harsher penal laws were barely enacted, the English state saw the Catholic community as a cash-cow, and there was a clear split between Papist politics, which attracted a series of oddballs across the confessional spectrum, and religious Catholicism.[158] Colin Haydon meanwhile suggests that while there existed mundane friction between Protestant and Catholics, the brunt of popular ire was against the vague caricature of the European Papist.[159] While violence did tend to spike when soldiers returned home from European wars, this only underscored the general tendency towards peaceful coexistence. [160] Before restrictions on inheritance and land ownership were relaxed, Protestant friends and relatives often held estates in trust.[161] The very brutality of the legal system, moreover, discourage implementation. 'A short sojourn in the country' for the offender,[162] or even a 'noli proseque' from the King should 'an over-nice justice of the peace' attempt prosecution were other

[154] Geremy Carnes, *The Papist Represented: Literature and the English Catholic Community, 1688 - 1791* (Lanham, MD: University of Delaware Press, 2017), xxiii.
[155] Carnes, xxiv; See also Cardinal J.H Newman's sketch of his adoptive church pre-emancipation in his "second spring" sermon of 1852 as "old fashioned house of gloomy appearance, with an iron gate," its inhabitants a 'mere handful of individuals". Cardinal Newman, 'The Second Spring' quoted in Edward Norman. *Roman Catholicism in England from the Elizabethan Settlement to the Second Vatican Council.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 3.
[156] Eamon Duffy, *Joseph Berington and the English Catholic Cisalpine Movement, 1772*–1803 (unpublished PhD thesis, Cambridge University, 1973).
[157] John Bossy, *The English Catholic Community, 1570 – 1850* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1975), 184.
[158] J.C.H Aveling, *The Handle and the Ax* (Colchester: Bondd and Briggs, 1976), 214, 157, 162.
[159] Colin Haydon, *Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth-century England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), 11-12.
[160] Haydon, *Anti-Catholicism*, 53-4.
[161] Gabriel Glickman, *The English Catholic Community, 1688 – 1745: Politics, Culture, and Ideology* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), 61.
[162] Glickman, 59

methods.[163] This distinction between Popery and Catholicism is mirrored by Chinicci's work in the early 80s on the political split between whiggish Cisalpines and Ultramontanes - those who rejected and lauded the Pope's secular political claims respectively. Chinnici underscored the intellectual vibrancy of English Catholic thought, as well as its links both to Locke and to the European Catholic enlightenment.[164] Lead by Sir Richard Throckmorton, Lord Petre, and Charles Butler, Ulrich Lehner describes how 'they articulated their Anglo-Gallican vision of a Conciliarist Church [which] should be governed like the British state.'[165] Gabriel Glickman's intervention in 2009 both builds on and complicates the work of Duffy, Bossy, and Chinnici. Foregrounding Lehner by prioritising the European diasporic contexts of English Catholic society, Glickman describes a vibrant intellectual life.[166] Memories of the civil war loomed large in recusant families, 'In pamphlet literature and private treatises, Catholics forged a shield for liberty and toleration out of Civil War memories.'[167] Yet while impeccable Royalist credentials may have helped ground claims to civil liberties after the restoration, after 1688 'Catholics were punished not for their acts of subversion, but for the very good faith that they had sought to prove for so long.'[168] Jacobite ideology became inextricable from Civil War memory. 'When Edward Tyldesley unfurled the Jacobite standard at Preston in 1715, he chose the banner held aloft by his great-grandfather, a royalist colonel.'[169] Anglicans were berated for 'breaking with the loyalist consensus.'[170] Glickman thus describes a split between loyalty to a co-religionist monarch and to the English state, in the context of travel and correspondence between St Germain, the English Colleges, and Catholic families in England.[171] This was complicated further by mounting tensions between the exiled court and the Pope, in which intellectual threads present since Erasmus and the Gallican tendencies of James II culminated in the reformist and cisalpine rejection of Papal temporal power.[172] 'Catholic Jacobite and Hanoverian pamphleteers jousted for ownership of

[163] Bradley, 84.
[164] Joseph P. Chinnici, *The English Catholic Enlightenment: John Lingard and the Cisalpine Movement, 1780 – 1850* (Shepherdstown: Patmos Press, 1980), 6.
[165] Ulrich L Lehner, *The Catholic Enlightenment: The Forgotten History of a Global Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 19. This also serves as an excellent survey of European Catholicism in the Enlightenment.
[166] Glickman, *The English Catholic Community*, 16.
[167] Glickman, 29.
[168] Glickman, 47.
[169] Glickman, 47.
[170] Ibid.
[171] Glickman, 12.
[172] Glickman, 17.
Ironically, Glickman identifies a tendency in recusant thought during the Restoration which sought to present the Gallican church - i.e a part of the tyrannical model which rebels identified as planned by James II - as an

the language of patriotism, public virtue and the 'ancient constitution.'[173] Unsurprisingly, the Papacy took this as a direct threat. Along with suspicions of Jansenism:

> claims were levelled against errant doctrines preached at the heart of the exiled Jacobite court and the English colleges in Paris and Douai, while the émigré community in St Germain reeled under threat of arrests, denunciations, and lettres de cachets. Later, the court tutor Andrew Michael Ramsay was turned away from the city of Rome, due to his espousal of the theologically distinct but equally illicit quietist creed of Archbishop Francois Fénelon.[174]

This in turn fostered the division between English and European Catholics, with the former eager to emphasise their shared history with their Protestant neighbours. Indeed, Catholic gentry who remained behind could 'gain a lease of life in post-revolution England if they rejected devotional seclusion, to discharge the patrician duties of sociability and hospitality.'[175] Catholics were therefore able 'to shade into the hinterland of a gentry [argued to be] becoming ever more homogenous' in its class concerns.'[176] To take this further, the post-Revolutionary Anglican state offered Catholic social participation if Catholics conformed in speech, dress, and sociability. But this very offer only further underscores the difficulty of classifying late eighteenth-century court and state, whether fiscal-military or sociable, because it could be in theory composed of those whose

Yet this sociability was, as *Cecilia* demonstrates, critical to Hanoverian supremacy. Sociable spaces were pluralistic only insofar as social and religious difference was repressed. Confessional and dynastic boundaries remained a matter of public concern and oral cultures of loyalty and resistance remained strong. Oaths, Glickman argues, were pointedly required at times of national emergencies.[177] Murray Pittock, meanwhile, points to a dangerously vibrant oral culture of loyalty and sedition. Lord Chief Justice Pemberton's 1681 comment that '"what is uttered and spoken" had become treasonable' points not only, as Pittock infers, to the state struggling to match legislation to existential threats, but also surely to concerns

---

acceptable model of Catholic political thought, one that explicitly drew on Anglican ideas of via media. Glickman, 38.

[173] Glickman, 13.

[174] Glickman, 15.

[175] Glickman, 63

[176] Ibid.

[177] Glickman, 59

that private reservations might hide behind ritualised pronouncements of oaths.[178] Indeed, by the end of William's reign, the fear of 'mumbling', mental reservation, or taking a form of the oath that evaded unpleasant doctrinal rejections led to a tightening of language, and a turn towards a more explicit rejection of papal claims.[179] The Jacobites in turn had their own oaths, which were invoked at times of particular crisis.[180] Private reservations were accompanied by a material culture of resistance. Building on his previous work that argued British xenophobia focussed on internal difference rather than Francophobia,[181] Pittock goes on to identify an early eighteenth-century material culture where almost any item of jewellery, material, or tableware could be requisitioned to signify Jacobite dissent, confessional or otherwise, with varying degrees of legibility for outsiders.[182] An oath, for example, might be given by a wearer of Jacobite jewellery kept close to the skin. This material culture, as Madame Duval's assault by Captain Mirvan in *Evelina* demonstrates, continued well after the threat of insurrection had passed. Understanding how oral and material cultures of sedition and loyalty interweaved underscores how the political and religious aims of sociable spaces in which fashionable consumption and polite behaviour dominated. A brooch, dress, or hairstyle might represent Jacobite loyalty, but that meaning is reduced to its fashionable value. In other words, Burney understands that the polite commerce of Smith and Chapone imposes a way of speaking, consumption, and dressing that sublimates other dialects and loyalties as merely 'impolite', rather than signifiers of competing identities. Alternate political realities are subsumed into the realm of the aesthetic then, but they remain unsettlingly present in the public sphere for those able yet forbidden to read them.

The totalising claims of this commercial polite sociability thus complicates distinguishing between public and private life. Since politeness invited Catholics and Protestants, merchants and aristocrats alike to mingle in commercial society at the cost of disregarding awkward family loyalties, the intrusion of these sociable spaces into the family home marks Hanoverian claims over kinship and the family. Where, in other words, did home life behind

[178] Murray Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition, 1688 – 1760: Treacherous Objects, Secret Places* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 7.
[179] Pittock, 8-9.
[180] Pittock, 9.
[181] Murray Pittock, *Celtic Identity and the British Image* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 25.
[182] Pittock, *Material Culture*, 14, 29-30.

and public life end if politeness was performed in one's drawing room? How could one remain a loving granddaughter to a Catholic woman if politeness meant ignoring her tales of persecution? This schism between public and private lives and identities was particularly jarring for the Burneys, caught as they were between marginalised family and friends and their aristocratic and wealthy patrons. Burney's novels continually work through these tensions. Her heroines are not only struggling to balance private affection and family devotion, family duty and respectable order. This does not just mirror the disrupted social order, but in the disrupted family qua social order points to a more fundamental split between familial and national identity. In this sense, then, the tension between sanguineal and affective kinship worked through in Perry and Burgess must be placed against the moderate claims of Hanoverian legitimacy. To put it yet another way, the claims of transnational families with Catholic and Protestant, English and French and Scottish branches all related and working together sat uneasily against the revolution in commercial sociability that was key to Georgian legitimacy.

This pointedly mirrors the tension between conformity and private opinion of the Hanoverian monarchs. George I's mother Sophia of Hanover's marriage contract with Ernst August stipulated her right to practice the Calvinism of her youth in private, while Hatton also underscores both her 'latitudinarian' and ecumenicist views, her hopes these might be imprinted on her children, and the ecumenical character of life at court.[183] George I himself maintained a 'strong Lutheranism' but nevertheless conformed to the Church of England.[184] This flexibility can also be seen in Hatton's identification of George's freedom of thought, and his attempts at granting concessions for dissenters and Catholics, nevertheless stymied by Walpole. [185] Andrew C. Thompson similarly points both to George II's ambivalent Protestantism noting 'it is difficult to discern what George's religious convictions were' and to his strong understanding of how to defend his rights, and thus how his 'concer[n] about the importance of preserving good order in both Church and State, and his desire to defend Protestant interests [...] went beyond simple political expediency.'[186] James Lees' work on

[183] Ragnhild Hatton, *George I* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), 47.
[184] Jeremy Black, 'Introduction' in Ragnhild Hatton, *George I* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), 1-8, 5.
[185] Hatton, 289.
[186] Andrew C. Thompson, *George II: King and Elector* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011), 106-7.

Frederick, Prince of Wales, further underscores the political and contingent nature of the tensions between outward conformity and private reservations. George II's son Frederick Lewis took communion at St Martin's in the Field, the doors open to the public, shortly after his investiture as Prince of Wales.[187] For Frederick, conformity was inextricably public and performative. His wife, however, who refused to conform upon her arrival in England in 1736, required convincing not only that this would 'contravene the Act of Succession but would also be disastrous for her public image.'[188] Of course, their public image was inextricable not just from their Anglicanism, but also from their split with Frederick's father George II, who forbade those who attended his son from attendance at court. Lees argues that this split was accompanied by Frederick's cultivation of overwhelmingly heterodox Anglican chaplains. In patronising Newtonians and Latitudinarians, he self-fashioned as an 'enlightened Anglican Prince' that nevertheless highlighted his 'conforming Anglican[ism].'[189] Gathering clergy of a church of which his father was the head in order to display his Anglicanism, and which as Lees points out would necessarily close off other branches of preferment for those chaplains, only further suggests the difficulty in unpicking Anglicanism from practice, or reducing it to a coherent doctrine beyond the question of performing conformity to church and state.

The first Hanoverian monarch to be born in London, speak English as his first language, and to never visit Hanover, George III's attitude to Anglicanism also marked another sea change from the enlightened disinterest of his grandfather and great-grandfather. Jeremy Black highlights his 'devout Anglicanism' and personal piety. Yet there are continuities with his predecessors, both in his personal interest in episcopal appointments (though highlighting their intellectual and religious qualities over the whiggish preferences of his predecessors), and in the inclusive nature of his divergent orthodoxy.[190] Nevertheless, as Black points out, the disjunction between his happiness to cultivate and stay with Catholic friends in the British gentry appears to stand awkwardly against his refusal to consider Catholic emancipation. Black explains this by pointing to his strong sense of duty to his role as monarch and head of

[187] J.C Lees, 'The Religious Retinue of Leicester House: Chaplains of Frederick Louis, Prince of Wales,1729 - 51', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol.40 No.1 (2017), 89 - 109, 89.
[188] Ibid. Jeremy Black argues that by the time of the birth of George III, Princess Augusta was a devout Anglican. Whether this was due to conversion, or whether her 'devoutness' was an extension of political expediency is debatable, though the latter seems more probable considering her hatred of the latitudinarianism her husband encouraged amongst his clerics. Jeremy Black, *George III: America's Last King* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008),187.
[189] J.C Lees, 101.
[190] Black, *George III*, 190.

the Church of England. Indeed, this makes even more sense if we remember Anglicanism's quite separate role both as a matter of intellectual assent to a set of catechistic beliefs, and thereby - particularly for George III - as loyalty to, and participation with, the state. The work of Brubaker and Fahrmeir, placed alongside the "many hats" metaphor of Colley inter alia, in the context of the Royal Family, point to the inextricability of conformity with participation. The tension came from the naturalising claims of that identity and the quotidian evidence of negotiation between a plurality of identities, and different ways of being Christian and living in England.

It is no wonder then that Burney's own struggles with conformity struggle to disentangle the boundaries between straightforward study of the Book of Common Prayer and the challenges of 'being' Anglican. But it is this disjunction that bears repeating as this thesis progresses. Attempts to write a history of religion as a history of ideas in itself must fail unless we see the disjunction between the intellectual battles of 18th century print culture alongside the negotiation of power as the Hanoverian state struggled to make Britain. In this sense, then, this thesis uses Frances Burney's writing to disrupt neat distinctions between intellectual, social, and religious history.

Women and religion in the long eighteenth century.

Writing in the mid-990s, Amanda Vickery wrote that 'it is almost impossible to open a book on wealthier British women between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries that does not offer a catalogue of declining female options.'[191] According to this long held belief - which Vickery punctures - with the rise of the industrious middle classes came a crystallisation of separate spheres, with public political influence the preserve of men, and homely domesticity reserved for women. This conception was enhanced by feminist historians of the 1960s who, Linda Kerber argues, influenced by Barbara Welter's identification of a 'cult of domesticity', 'reinforced the centrality of the metaphor of separate spheres.'[192] As Vickery goes on to

[191] Amanda Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998), 1-2.
[192] Linda K. Kerber, 'Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History', *The Journal of American History* Vol. 75, No. 1 (Jun., 1988), 9-39, 1.1

argue, not only does this metaphor fail to capture the depth of difference between counties and classes in England, it also ignores the extent to which genteel women had a self-conception of 'upright strength, stoical fortitude, and self-command.'[193] 'Feminine servility was the ineradicable mark of the kitchen maid, not her employer.'[194] Nor was the Georgian home a prison. Whether in the home or in one of a number of sociable spaces in the city, genteel women could 'use the language of politeness and civility' to navigate homosocial spaces and 'demand social consideration.'[195] Indeed, Vickery identifies the critical role of print culture to 'la[y] claim to expanded cultural horizons through reading and exchanging periodicals, pamphlets, papers, and novels, through letters, and through cultural consumption on an unprecedented scale.'[196] This final section of the introduction continues the problematisation of public and private to argue that debates over separate spheres reflects the loyalist work of legitimacy, carving out sociability from family and other loyalties. Sociable women of Burney's uncertain class, by whose politeness and curation Georgian society was supposed to be knit together, were critical labourers of the polis. The politeness taught in the conduct books and enforced as ever by patriarchal violence naturalised Anglican moderation, which in turn underscored the legitimacy of the Hanoverian regime and concurrently their historical claims regarding reclamation of liberty and commerce.

Across the confessional divide, women's involvement in eighteenth-century public life is increasingly well-acknowledged, as is their targeted exclusion in the reform bill of 1832.[197] The example of Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire was remarkable only for the opprobrium, and the lack of explicit voting rights did not restrict genteel and aristocratic ownership from exercising political influence. Catholic women mediated between their family and their Protestant neighbours and family during the worst of the penal laws.[198] Politeness, much contemporary work argues, was a key means by which political agency could be exercised by women. Lawrence Klein envisaged a diverse 'idiom for a wide range of people' from many

[193] Vickery, *Gentleman's Daughter,* 8.
[194] Ibid.
[195] Vickery, *Gentleman's Daughter,* 9.
[196] Ibid.
[197] Elaine Chalus, 'Women, Electoral Privilege and Practice in the Eighteenth-Century,' in Kathryn Gleadle and Sarah Richardson, eds, *Women in British Politics, 1760 - 1800* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), 19-38, 19; Judith Lewis, *Sacred to Female Patriotism: Gender, Class, and Politics in Late Georgian Britain* (New York and London: Routledge, 2003), 1-5.
[198] Jan Broadway 'Agnes Throckmorton: a Jacobean Recusant Widow' in Peter Marshal and Geoffrey Scott (eds), *Catholic Gentry in English Society: the Throckmortons of Coughton from Reformation to Emancipation*(Farnham: Ashgate, 2008), 123 – 143, 123 - 4.

different social classes, but which nevertheless 'facilitat[ed] interaction and access to shared experience.' [199] Learning a polite 'modest, refined language', Janet Sorensen argued, 'could dampen the enflamed language of civil war and Jacobite rebellions' while knitting together a society riven by private interest and the rise of a merchant class.[200] In so doing, Dongu adds, politeness 'was much more than amiable social behaviour. Its purpose was to relate the individual to the social body in a harmonic fashion so as to eliminate factiousness and intolerance.'[201]Alun Withey's work has demonstrated how, as gentility became a matter of behaviour rather than birth, politeness was both enacted on and by the bodies of those who performed and embodied it.[202] Politeness was particularly critical for women. An explosion of conduct books written by and for women, for example Hester Chapone and Hannah Moore, instructed genteel adolescent women on how to behave in urban sociable spaces where they were expected to act as the glue towards this polite society, employing polite manners to shape the conversation away from fractious topics.[203] Susan Matthews points in particular to the influence of the Gordon Riots, with conservative women after 1780 seen as 'agents of social control', thereby setting examples for polite behaviour that might heal the rift between Catholics and the Protestant establishment.[204] Polite sociability was both the means by which agency could be exerted in a common language, while at the same time working out the acceptable limits of gendered behaviour.

Critical here is the work of Emma Major. Major argues in *Madam Britannia* for the inextricability of faith, gender, and nation. The eighteenth-century Anglican Church was increasingly figured as a woman representing a golden mean of behaviour between the extremes of Catholicism and Puritanism.[205] Attempting to emulate this ideal of Anglican

[199] Lawrence E Klein, 'Politeness and the Interpretation of the British Eighteenth Century,' *The Historical Journal* Vol 45. No. 4 (December 2002), 869 – 898, 873.
[200] Janet Sorenson, *The Grammar of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 141-2.
[201] Maria Grazia Dongu, 'How far from the madding crowd? Gray, Algarotti, and the European Republic of letters,' in Frédéric Ogée, ed., *"Better in France?": The Circulation of Ideas Across the Channel in the Eighteenth Century* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2005). 252 – 268, 261
[202] Alun Withey, *Technology, Self Fashioning, and Politeness in Eighteenth-Century Britain: Refined Bodies* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 43.
[203] Michele Cohen, 'Manliness, Effeminacy, and the French: Gender and the Construction of National Character in Eighteenth-century England,' in Tim Hitchcock and Michele Cohen, eds., *English Masculinities, 1660 – 1800* (Harlow: Addison, Wesley, Longman, 1999), 44 – 67, 57 – 8.
[204] Susan Matthews, "'Mad Misrule': The Gordon Riots and Conservative Memory,", in Ian Haywood and John Seed (eds.), *The Gordon Riots* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 226 – 242, 226.
[205] Emma Major, *Madam Britannia: Women, Church, and Nation, 1712 – 1812* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 32-3.

national womanhood 'allowed some women to see themselves as active agents in the shaping of the nation.'[206] Not only does Major see the religious influences in the conduct books of Chapone inter alia, the use of clothes and other bodily material culture to demonstrate political leanings, but also along with Withey identifies the gendered body itself as a vehicle for politeness. [207] Like Colley, Major sees this identity as plural and shifting. She cites Jane Randall in calling for a plurality of publics is helpful in thinking about the layers of identity that might empower or weaen people according to their race, sex, class, denomination, and even parish. [208] Emma Major thus binds together the religious, historical, and national to view Anglicanism as inextricable from post-1688 nation building. Yet if we add Fahrmeir and Brubakers' work along with Bayly's identification of the world-crisis of the period 1780-1820, then not only does the critical role of genteel Anglican women in eighteenth-century society become apparent, but the degree to which this overlapping series of gendered guidelines here broadly defined as 'Anglican' could be seen as an inextricable part of the process of nation building.

This argument builds on my previous work on how politeness naturalised Hanoverian supremacy.[209] As Sorensen points out, the linguistic evidence does not bear out Colley's idea of many hats theory of identity.[210] While politeness sought, for Sorensen, to paper over the cracks of difference, I have previously argued that Burney saw a full-body gendered experience of polite Anglican identity - as a habitus - that placed women's bodies under unbearable and, in the case of Catholic or marginalised women, deadly strain. Ooliteness was a fundamentally hegemonic discourse that sought to deny Catholic claims to English history at the very moment it appeared to offer them a common language with their Protestant neighbours. This thesis expands this to the process of nation building. Women were not merely learning to be polite Anglicans in reading and enacting the advice of the conduct books but were simultaneously learning to become British at the same moment they enacted that Britishness. If polite behaviour could be said to reinforce reified concepts of gender,

[206] Major, *Madam Britannia,* 2-3.
[207] Major, *Madam Britannia,* 4, 32-3, 33-4, 36. Jennifer Novotny also sees the possibilities for needlework and clothing to express political opinion. Jennifer Novotny, 'Polite War: Material Culture of the Jacobite Era; 1688 – 1790.' In Alan McInnes, Kieran German, and Lesley Graham (eds.) *Living with Jacobitism, 1690 – 1788* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2014), 153 – 172, 158.
[208] Major, *Madam Britannia,* 7-8.
[209] Daniel Waterfield, ''My brain is on fire!' Anglican Womanhood and the Limits of Politeness in Frances Burney's *Cecilia' Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies, 42* (1) 2009, 49-66.
[210] Janet Sorenson, *The Grammar of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 7.

nation, and Anglican 'enlightened' supremacy, then impolite behaviour was further associated with either Calvinist enthusiasm or Popish superstition or, as Major identified, 'Harlotry'. Pace Sorensen and Colley, this implies a multiplicity of identities, each one dependent on the contexts in which they were to be performed. I would add, however that these the boundaries were policed by a patriarchal violence that punished other forms of womanhood as un-British, un-Anglican, and un-Womanlike. In other words, women's polite behaviour naturalised a novel social order where religion, gender, and state were bound up. I here clarify my previous work by remarking on the importance of understanding the ideological importance of history and commerce to performing loyalism. Purchasing the correct fashionable items did not just edge out aristocratic family memories, shifting economic power away from the land and towards the market. The very act of doing so was critical to the much wider social remaking being done under George III.

Of course, there exists an awkward incoherence in self-consciously instructing national identity through gender norms. We can see part of this in Jeremy Gregory's observation regarding the links between masculinity and Protestantism that:

> The nexus between Protestantism, masculinity and Englishness was forged, then, as part of a contrast between the vices of an effeminate continental Catholicism and the virtues of a healthy. Masculine Protestantism. It was only in Protestant England, so the rhetoric ran, that the religious male could truly flourish, it was only in Protestant England that all men could aspire to be homo religiosis. [211]

If it was only in Protestant England that man could aspire to be homo religiosis, it was thanks to the improving and formative qualities of the polite woman who brought the ideology of the expansive court to sociable spaces. Yet homo religiosis, just like the improving conversation, required the Calvinist and Catholic others, at home and abroad, to compare itself against. The central issue, then, is the emerging nation state's reliance on negotiation with alternate histories and identities, as prevalent within as they were without, and the very meanings of which its language and commerce sought to deny.

[211] Jeremy Gregory, 'Homo Religiosis: Masculinity and Religion in the Long Eighteenth Century' in Hitchcock and Cohen, eds., *English Masculinities, 1660 – 1800* (Harlow: Addison, Wesley, Longman, 1999), 85 – 110, 110.

The chapters of this thesis are centred on Burney's novels, with the exception of Chapter three, which uses Burney's letters from court. Much has been written about Frances' attitude to writing, its semi-autobiographical role, her diaries addressed to 'nobody', her reluctance to describe her novels as novels, as well as how her letters home from court would have been circulated and performed for the benefit of her family. A common quality ascribed to her writing is that of compulsion. Burney wrote because - or in part due to - the restrictions placed on any other form of expression. Her writing was at once an escape valve and a way of making sense of the incongruities of the world. It is no surprise then that she remained at best profoundly ambivalent about publication, and at worst terrified by the thought of being unable to control who read her work. To be read was, for Frances, to be seen and examined, and she therefore unsurprisingly spent a great deal of her last years first editing her father's correspondence and rewriting his biography and then erasing, transcribing, and editing her own diaries and correspondence before leaving instructions for her niece to do the same.

This leads us to a fundamental problem in the primary sources of Burney studies. Not only are they curated first by Burney and then by her niece, creating an edited repository - though this is itself illuminating in revealing how Burney wished to be immortalised - that is simultaneously plagued by omissions and erasure. Much of her writing has been burned or deleted, though Optical Character Recognition and digital technologies derived from reconstructing palimpsests proves hopeful. Everything legible is now published via the Burney Centre at McGill, though advanced age has rendered their microfilm collection mostly illegible, and as such I relied during my tenure at the centre on Joyce Hemlow's original transcriptions of the family's correspondence. Where possible, Frances, Charles Burney pere and fils, Hester Thrale, and Samuel Johnson's correspondence has been consulted, mostly via the British Library Add MS and Harvard MS Hyde collections. I remain ineffably thankful for the ASECS and Harvard funding which permitted my time in America and Canada.

In bringing together Burney's novels, diaries, correspondence, and to a lesser extent dramatic works, this thesis contributes to histories of eighteenth-century nationalism via literary

biography, focusing as it does on Frances Burney's output and her intellectual circles. The role of literature as a historical source may be controversial, especially when placed alongside the use of diaries and letters. There is however a long tradition in cultural studies, best typified by Greenblatt's work in the late 80s, through to more recent work on women writers in the long eighteenth century and their reaction to the French Revolution, and I draw on the latter throughout.[212] Indeed as we have already seen, work on nationalist studies underscores the importance of printed material to the formation of nation states and the formation of post-Habermassian public spheres. There is, therefore, a strong scholarly link for this thesis' main contention that Burney used her novels to work out and navigate the competing textual claims on British national identity. The intertextuality with the conduct books which informed Burney's early life, and which she excoriated in print only to then procure for her own Franco-British son moreover points to vibrant literary culture where Hanoverian Britishness could be written and replied to, the investigation of which sheds new light on how Anglicanism and Britishness were 'unsettled and unsettling.' This begs the question of how far the state pushed and created this logic. How far, in other words, did the logic of Hume translate to the policy of the court, and how did the policy of the court translate to the rise of the market's commodification of troubling histories. Such questions of intellectual transmission are beyond the scope of this project. What is not however, is how Burney identified how conduct literature, history, philosophy, and theology delineated the gendered body, and how the logic of the sociable marketplace described herein worked both to support the king and disrupt memory, history, and family.

Chapters.

Chapter one focuses on Burney's first novel, *Evelina* (1778). It reads the young woman's introduction into the world against the spectre of her Franco-British grandmother who threatens to claim her and absent father Sir John Belmont who refuses to recognise her as a struggle by her Anglican curate guardian to shape an ideal Anglican young woman against competing Stuart and Catholic lineages. In an ending in which her grandmother is ignored, her father is recognised and her legitimacy assured, and her guardian placated, Burney

[212] Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

suggests the possibility of balancing competing and contradictory identities, both for herself and for the nation at large.

Chapter two builds on my previously published work on *Cecilia* (1782). The heroine, an heiress whose fortune is dependent on her future husband taking her family name, attempts to convince the proud Delvile family to accept the clause. In contrast to secular or kinship readings however, this chapter suggests Burney fictionalises an Anglican and Catholic encounter. Cecilia's polite attempts to convince the Catholic Delviles are shown as nothing more than a cover for the hegemony which she typifies, and which threatens to erase Catholic Englishness. Playing with Smithian ideas of value and exchange, Burney argues that market forces are similarly bound up with Hanoverian legitimacy in deracinating the land and homes which continue Catholic memory. In a lukewarm ending, Burney suggests reconciliation is possible - but only if, like Cecilia, Anglican hegemony sheds economic violence.

Chapter three deals with Burney's life at court. With the prospect of marriage receding, Burney is offered a position at court as second keeper of the robes. While her father is overjoyed at the possibility of royal influence, Frances herself describes her time as a gothic immuration. While Queen Charlotte discussed the freedoms of a female salon and alludes to the protestant convents proposed by inter alia Mary Astell, Burney's love for the Royal Family is balanced by metaphors of cloisters and automata. This unhappy period intensifies these two tendencies: an understanding of the impossibility of freedom within an Anglican Womanhood the constructed nature of which the Royals only underscore, and Frances' horror at the possibility of its destruction and renewed bloodshed.

Chapter four suggests *Camilla* (1796), written in the wake of the French Revolution and her marriage to a emigre ci-devant aristocrat, continues in the tradition of broken inheritances of *Cecilla* and *Evelina* while explicitly linking the violence of the deracinated marketplace to new 'natural' hierarchies of sex, nation, and race. Unsurprisingly, with the influence of the French Revolution and her time at court, Burney is even more explicit in her fear of the shifting, illegible landscapes and kinship patterns risk a resurgence of sectarian and even Jacobin violence.

The final chapter, **chapter five** examines Burney's final novel *The Wanderer* (1814). Written after a decade trapped in France during the height of the Napoleonic Wars, it has long been

seen by critics as the point at which Burney's support for Catholicism begrudgingly arrives in a re-writing of *Evelina*. In contrast to this however, this chapter sees it as the culmination of a discussion which began with *Evelina*. Full of the unsettling racial ambiguity and criticism of English society seen in her earlier novels, *The Wanderer* reflects a culmination of her political and personal thought for a woman whose son was now as caught between Catholicism and English Anglicanism as Frances had been some thirty to forty years previously. It is no wonder that it ultimately argues for a pragmatic conservatism, as while she affirms Hume and Rousseau's rejection of national myths as a cover for violence, she nevertheless ends with an affirmation of the Christianity of Catholics which segues into a toast to the King in celebration of a longed for marriage. In contrast to the lukewarm endings of *Cecilia* and *Camilla*, then, Burney's final novel seems to affirm the protection marriage and King provide against the uncertainties of a disintegrating international order.

Chapter one: '[T]hough it was difficult to discover whether she was an English or a French woman': Legitimacy, Nationality, and Gender in Frances Burney's Evelina (1778)

Writing at the end of the 1980s, Margaret Anne Doody tracked growing critical disquiet with the heroine of Frances Burney's first novel *Evelina* (1778). Traditionally read as a novel of manners, Doody instead emphasised recent feminist scholarship on the novel's prevalence of absent fathers, dead mothers, and the heroine's too-ready acquiescence to 'snobbish, conventional, and misogynistic society.'[1] Instead, Doody emphasised Evelina's illegitimacy. She is 'unplaced in society, unclassified', granted by a male guardian her mother's maiden name as her first name, and refused a patriarchal last name which would have granted her 'gens and status.'[2] Julia Epstein shares Doody's concerns at readings of Evelina's culpability. Instead, 'it should be read […] as a feminist novel of education,' that explores the lines between innocence and experience.[3] The novel displays not only Burney's own identification between text and body, but 'quiet insurrection against a world that required women to submit to authority.'[4] Doody and Epstein's work thus point to more fundamental lacunae in Burney studies between the philosophy and history she read and her writing. The fact of her early reading of David Hume and Hester Chapone is widely accepted for example, but this has not heretofore led to a discussion of Burney's response to those intellectual movements beyond relatively narrow confines of her sex and class. Burney's writing, *Evelina* foremost among them, therefore risks remaining tied to the drawing room, even as critic after critic picks out the existential terrors of legitimacy, inheritance, and foreignness which plague each page. By contrast, this chapter argues that *Evelina* shows Frances haunted by contemporary questions of legitimacy, inheritance, religion, and national identity. On the brink of entering the world, the supposedly naïve voice of the heroine reveals a society terrifying in its precarity and violence. She finds the mature womanhood she is expected to develop

[1] Margaret Anne Doody, *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1988), 40.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Julia Epstein, *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 95.
[4] Ibid.

dangerously fabricated, where the boundaries of acceptable speech and behaviour are inextricable from a patriarchal violence that has the power to demarcate national boundaries. Rather than a satire of failed social climbing or the perils of being an aged woman, Duval points to the troubling Catholic or pan-European presence in families asked to prove their Britishness. Her stubbornly English roots in this conception only make her all the more dangerous for the alternate identities she offers Evelina. Reverend Villars' decision to send his guardian to be socialised in London as an inoculation against this influence therefore points to a novel of Hanoverian education. This in turn fictionalises 'acceptable' histories and identities post 1688, and only further underscores how questions of history and religion permeated Burney's work from the very beginning.

Burney was profoundly cynical. The didactic letters Villars sends Evelina highlight the disparity between conduct-book advice and the omnipresent patriarchal violence of the social marketplace in which Evelina has been sent to pick out acceptably natural clothes, behaviours, and relationships. Metaphors of theatricality and automation abound, as Evelina purchases and performs an identity that, despite Captain Mirvan's violent attacks on her grandmother, remain stubbornly and evidently constructed. *Evelina* thus shows the embodied nature of Hanoverian ideology within sociable spaces and the market economy. Evelina's evolution into woman and Hanoverian subject are inextricable, as family formation legitimates Hanoverian historical narratives and vice versa. While this chapter therefore acknowledges the fundamental terror at the heart of the novel at the same time it underscores its embeddedness within wider debates of kingship and legitimacy, Burney's early adeptness at writing back – which as Doody and Epstein rightly identified, conflates text and body – must be acknowledged. Indeed, this seems to be the sole novel in which Burney acknowledges the possibility of agency for women, both in Evelina's sophisticated literary responses to her guardian, and in a resolution which successfully balances affective and sanguineal relationships.

This chapter first contends that Evelina is sent to London to be socialised into a mature and polite British national identity. It then asserts her clergyman guardian and her dangerously Franco-British grandmother represent in turn Hanoverian and Jacobite theories of British history and sovereignty over the heroine-as-nation. The spectre of Madame Duval does not just represent embarrassing class origins, but the embarrassing international links and faiths of the bullishly Protestant nation. Captain Mirvan's assaults on Madame Duval are therefore

not just embarrassing and violent patriarchal acts that teach Evelina about the dangers of womanhood, but show Burney revealing how the boundaries of a performative, material, and gendered nationality are policed by violence. While she can write back to her guardian to dissuade, cajole, and reply to his morality, women's polite negotiation is useless against Mirvan. 'Seeing the world as it really is', Evelina discovers, grants no real power other than a crushing knowledge of the violence that underpins the law, divides families, and silences women. The social mask she learns to wear is painful, theatrical, and profoundly unnatural, but it is the best defence against male violence and perhaps still permits discordant sympathies. Finally, it contends that the cri du sang of Evelina and her biological father's reunion represents Burney's defence of the troubling legacy of Catholic claims, while in her final rush with her new husband back to her Anglican guardian, the potential that the social mask of polite identity might permit the preservation of discordant, private selves.

The spectre of France casts a deep shadow over Evelina's adolescence. Evelina's mother, who like Evelina 'was brought up under my care' on the deathbed wishes of Mr Evelyn, met with disaster after her remarried mother 'sent for her to Paris.'[5] Similarly, when Duval first talks at length with her granddaughter, she:

> talked very much of taking me to Paris, and said I greatly wanted the polish of a French education. She lamented that I had been brought up in the country, which, she observed, had given me a very bumpkinish air. However, she bid me not despair, for she had known many girls much worse than me, who had become very fine ladies after a few years residence abroad; and she particularly instanced a Miss Polly Moore, daughter of a chandler's-shop woman, who, by an accident not worth relating, happened to be sent to Paris, where, from an awkward ill-bred girl, she so much improved, that she has since been taken for a woman of quality.[6]

Yet this is not just a parodic allusion to Duval's own transformation from 'a waiting girl at a tavern' into a soi-disant 'person of fashion' and the possibilities – or not 'taken for' - of such

[5] Burney, *Evelina*, 16.
[6] Burney, *Evelina*, 69.

mutability.[7] It is also a direct and heretofore missed allusion to Frances Burney's own stepsister, Elizabeth 'Bessie' Allen. 'In late 1775,' Simon Macdonald points out, Frances' stepsister 'Elizabeth Allen was sent to Paris in order to spend an extended period there under the supervision of Isabella Strange, a family friend.'[8] The hope, according to Hemlow, was that although she was 'quite unimprovable, the stay in Paris would complete her education.'[9] Yet when her mother 'travelled to Paris in August 1777' to visit and accompany her back to England, she instead eloped with Samuel Meeke 'more than twenty years older than her', and whom she married at Ypres in October the same year.[10] This family's embarrassment – and Frances' own dislike of Bessie - was well-known in Charles' circle.[11] France is therefore both a place more generally that influences English fashions and identity, where one's ability or inability to learn the strictures of polite sociability sublimate or highlight the class one sought to escape. But in the context of the Burney family, Madame Duval's erratic and embarrassing behaviour is inextricable from Bessie Allen's time 'completing her education' under a close, Jacobite, family friend.

Nevertheless, Lady Howard agrees that socialisation is key. In order to imbibe British womanhood Evelina needs to experience 'something of the world' in order to properly understand why Madame Duval's behaviour is unacceptable. As Michele Cohen has pointed out, 'social spaces' involved 'the mixed company of the sexes,' which in Addisonian terms 'was mutually regulatory and improving' for each set of gendered polite behaviour.[12] Lady Howard suggests this is what Evelina's mother lacked: 'Rigidly sequestered' from the world at Howard Grove, her 'lively and romantic imagination' was left to run wild, which in turn led to Madame Duval, Paris, and a ruinous marriage.[13] As Villars himself is forced to admit, Evelina is similarly 'rustic' having spent her entire childhood 'in this retired place' where 'the nearest town, is seven miles distant.[14] Although she enjoyed some socialisation outside

[7] Burney, *Evelina,* 15, 53.
[8] Simon Macdonald, 'Identifying Mrs Meeke: Another Burney Family Novelist' *The Review of English Studies,* 64 (2013), 367 – 385, 376.
[9] Joyce Hemlow, *The History of Fanny Burney* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), 70.
[10] Macdonald, 'Identifying Mrs Meeke', 376.
[11] Samuel Johnson heard of these events with barely concealed delight at Elizabeth Burney's parental dismay. Samuel Johnson to Hester Lynch Thrale, 22nd October 1777, *MS Hyde 1,* Harvard.

[12] Michele Cohen, 'Manliness, Effeminacy, and the French: Gender and the Construction of National Character in Eighteenth-century England,' in *English Masculinities, 1660 – 1800,* (Harlow: Addison, Wesley, Longman, 1999), 44 – 67, 57 – 8.
[13] Burney, *Evelina,* 18.
[14] Burney, *Evelina,* 21.

the neighbourhood, her visits to the Howard family have been 'discontinued for more than four years' due to 'the impressions which the misfortunes of her mother have made on my heart.'[15] Yet this zealous seclusion, extending even to Evelina's pseudonymous surname, has the opposite effect.[16] Lack of socialisation and radical localism, Lady Howard suggests, does not engender the charming rusticity and innocence Villars hopes. Instead, as her pseudonymous name points out, it leaves young women and their ' awkwardly vulnerable to mixed models of nationality that reflect too well European influences.[17] But this national education is itself fragile, defined more by its relationship against foreign and moral infection than positive qualities.[18] As Reverend Villars himself admits, 'this is not an age in which we may trust to appearances.'[19] His charge must learn the correct ways of reading this social text, of the signification of signs, in order to properly avoid the many dangers.

Villars' constant letters, however, contain careful advice. Being an Anglican clergyman, this patriarchal advice has a religious bent. Worrying for 'the unsullied whiteness of [her] soul,' Villars' gendered language of purity echoes the immensely popular conduct book writer Fordyce, who 'describ[ed] piety as a female charm', while '*the Christian Lady's Pocket Book* for 1792' encourages its readers to don modesty as they do rouge, and 'chearfulness [sic] as a lip salve.'[20] Burney's letters and diaries are full of references to and lists of conduct books, which 'attempted to resolve uncertainties' in the great chain of being by training women and the rising middle classes into the norms of the elite spaces in which they found themselves.[21] While 'Madame d'Arblay was too great a novelist to present her heroines as flawless

---

[15] Burney, *Evelina*, 18.
[16] Villars always 'called her by the name of Anville, and reported in this neighbourhood that her father, my intimate friend, left her to my guardianship.' Burney, *Evelina*, 21.
[17] Anville is dangerously close to En Ville, pointing to her future in a transnational, frenchified city. Julia Epstein and Kristina Straub have both pointed out the marginalisation at play here. 'Naming is never a simple process' for Burney, Julia Epstein argues, 'tied as it is to […] class, family, marriage, lineage, and inheritance.' While Kristina Straub reflects how Burney 'refuses to extend her language to patch over the contradictions often implicit in cultural ideology, contradictions that tend to leave disturbing rifts in the fabric of words.'
Julia Epstein *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and The Politics of Women's Writing* (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1989), 3; Kristina Straub, *Divided Fictions: Fanny Burney and Feminine Strategy* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1989). 2.
[18] In this way, Evelina's childhood reflects Dror Wahrman's conception of an Ancien Regime of identity, 'unfixed and potentially changeable […] sheddable, replaceable, or mouldable' which began to give way in the wake of the American War of Independence to a modern, discrete, and immutable essentialism. Dror Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004), 168.
[19] Burney, *Evelina*, 308-9.
[20] Emma Major, *Madam Britannia: Women, Church, and Nation, 1712 – 1812* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 193.
[21] Joyce Hemlow, 'Fanny Burney and the Courtesy Books,' *PMLA*, Vol 65, No. 5 (Sep. 1950), 732 – 761, 732. This of course further points to Burney's own social uncertainty.

patterns' her first three heroines are 'forced through the painful vicissitudes of love to correct their errors in conduct.'[22] Villars' letters, Hemlow argues, 'constitute a courtesy book astonishingly complete in such standard topics as fortitude, prudence, and the danger of being led astray by the imagination.'[23] The material creation of a polite body is therefore inextricable from religious expression. While Villars struggles to balance withdrawal from an engagement with the world, his letters nevertheless suggest he sees a strong Anglican faith as both a buttress against the world and critical element in secular identity. Anglican faith is tested by living in the world and yet remains inextricable from Addisonian social identity that emerges from the discourse of 'mixed company.' Yet as Emma Major goes on to comment, 'Evelina's experience […] suggests, piety was an awkward partner for a fashionable life.'[24] This conflict between the 'fashionable life' required to polish and create an Addisonian culture of politeness and the awkwardness of the negation at the heart of Anglican Womanhood threaten to undo its very performance in the world of alternatives on which it relies.

Evelina's sophisticated letters back to her guardian allow Burney to explore this tension between natural and moral right without fear of repercussions. Sarah Richardson argues letter writing - especially amongst elite women – held a latent disruptive possibility, pointing to Martineau and Grote's calls for friends to destroy all letters post-mortem, and for the former to describe letters as 'written speech.[25] Evelina almost directly echoes Harriet Martineau's description of 'written speech' when she assures Villars she writes her letters 'in the same manner as' if she were there before him.[26] Performing naivety becomes a trademark Burney literary device. When writing of the outrages of Lady Howard's son in law for example, the pugnacious naval officer Captain Mirvan, Evelina finds herself unable to write down his 'actual language, bowdlerising it […] for her mentor Reverend Villars.'[27] Evelina proves herself a sophisticated correspondent, aware of letters' 'subversive challenging role', yet willing and able to maintain a naïve epistolary voice to protect her virtue under the

[22] Hemlow, 'Fanny Burney and the Courtesy Books', 755-6.
[23] Hemlow, Fanny Burney and the Courtesy Books', 759.
[24] Emma Major, *Madam Britannia*, 193.
[25] Sarah Richardson, 'Well-neighboured Houses: The Political Networks of Elite Women, 1780 – 1860,' in Kathryn Gleadle and Sarah Richardson, eds, *Women in British Politics, 1760 – 1800* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), 56 – 73, 59.
[26] Burney, *Evelina*, 28.
[27] Janice Farrar Thadeus, *Frances Burney: A Literary Life* (Basingstoke: MacMillan, 2000), 36.

patriarchal eyes of her guardian. [28] That Evelina, indoctrinated by Villars from birth, seeks from the beginning to carve her own response to the advice of her male guardian, points to a radical and heretofore underexplored critique of Lady Howard and Reverend Villars' protective Anglican Womanhood in *Evelina*.

Much has been written about the links between eighteenth-century novels and the problem of social form. Ruth Perry argues eighteenth-century novels were obsessed with attempts to 'defin[e] family memberships' and relations, with the isolation of the heroine mirroring the social upheaval occasioned by a shift in kinship patterns away from ties of blood to those of affection.[29] Miranda J Burgess moreover suggests the messy romance plots of late eighteenth-century romance novels often served as a relatively safe way to grapple with the constitutional aftermath of the Glorious Revolution. They were exquisitely placed between 'political philosophy and the details of private life' and thus 'often tell stories of societies' formation and cohesion' and were understood as such by 'politicized readers'.[30]

Stuart legitimacy rested on a coherent and persuasive ideological foundation of divine right. Hanoverian supporters, on the other hand, consisted of 'whigs, anti-Jacobite Tories, and disillusioned former Jacobites – in any broad-based protestant consensus.'[31] Protestant writers consequently needed to construct a coherent theory of constitutional monarchy to legitimate not just the new family, but a social theory of monarchical government itself. Burgess argues that it was Locke's labour theory of value that provided this, and that it hinted that 'shared feeling holds the social fabric and its system of value together.'[32] Consequently, 'Britain's order' depended on 'heterosexual desire, which produces what the first treatise stipulates is the original division of labour, the first properly coherent and the earliest hierarchy of rank.'[33] Everything else follows from this. Romance plots, such as Richardson's

[28] Burney undertakes a similar game when she dedicates *Evelina* to her father in an introductory poem, where she identifies him as the 'author of my being' far more dear than 'the life blood that mantles in my breast.' In other words, like Evelina she understands that she is caught within a wider web of patriarchal and royal society. Letters, literature, and writing create and at times threaten to overwrite 'the life blood' of existing social relations, such as with her own maternal grandmother. Imperfect reproduction, in this system, reveals her as an imperfect copy of her father – a moral and familial failing that risks not just illegitimacy but treason. A scrupulous witness, carefully curated, however, both enshrines Hanoverian supremacy, paternal law, and reveals its flaw. Burney, 'To ___ ' in *Evelina.*
[29] Perry, *Novel Relations*, 3, 30, 1.
[30] Miranda J Burgess, *British Fiction and the Production of Social Order, 1740 – 1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 17.
[31] Burgess, *British Fiction*, 19.
[32] Burgess, *British Fiction*, 50.
[33] Ibid.

Pamela, caught 'between two 'rulers' with divergent accounts of the origin and justification of their rule' naturalised through family tension otherwise dry theories of political economy and work to imprint this new ideology of sentiment, and with it, Hanoverian supremacy. Eighteenth-century novels' fixation on troubled families such as Evelina then were not just mirrors or vehicles for grappling with shifts in kinship, but also figured much deeper and dangerous questions of royal legitimacy over Britain and its subjects.

Once we read Belmont as Stuart and Madame Duval as dangerously Jacobite, Reverend Villars' claims over Evelina contain a distinctly Hanoverian tinge. With Madame Duval 'for many years past, […] in continual expectation of making a journey to England,' Villars orders Lady Howard to reply that he did not mean to 'intentionally offend,' but that the delay 'was the earnest desire of one to whose will she owes implicit duty,' and that 'when the time arrives that she shall pay her duty to her grand-mother, Madame Duval will find no reason to be dissatisfied with what has been done for her.[34] Villars nevertheless believes that, having been responsible for 'the education of the father, daughter, and granddaughter' and with that authority renewed at each generation, 'the barbarous idea' of handing over Evelina to Duval would be 'deserting the sacred trust reposed in me.' In other words, the Anglican clergyman, while acknowledging the overriding legitimacy of authority-through-inheritance, nevertheless points to her grandmother's moral turpitude and their father's legal abuse – he 'infamously burnt the certificate of their marriage' - to rationalize his own authority.[35] This religious guardianship confers Whiggish paternal authority. 'I am not at an authority which deprives you of liberty,' he promises to Evelina during her first days in the capital,' but he will 'daily offer prayers for your felicity [and to] defend you from danger,' so he may gain 'the ultimate blessing of closing these aged eyes in the arms of one so dear - so deservedly beloved.'[36] As David Lemmings adroitly notes, in the wake of the Glorious Revolution 'tasked with defending the change of regime, the king's attempted manipulations of the law were given

[34] Burney, *Evelina,* 15.
[35] Terry Castle and David Lemmings both note the explosion of legislation which reified Hanoverian authority from the mid eighteenth century onwards. Castle points to Hardwicke's Marriage Act of 1754, which sought to regularise the marriage ceremony, while Lemmings highlights the friction between this new legislation and folk custom or local traditions.
Terry Castle *Masquerade and Civilisation: The Carnivalesque in Eighteenth-Century Fiction* (London: Methuen, 1986), 100;
David Lemmings, *Law and Government in England During the Long 18th century: from Consent to Command* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011), 1- 2.
[36] Burney, *Evelina,* 26.

equal prominence with the threat of popery as legitimate justifications for revolution.'[37] Villars rationalizes his own authority in similar terms of 'religion' and abuse of the law, writing a moral Anglican literature to guard against the corrosive influence of the Jacobite continent. Despite asserting his own moral claims to paternal authority however, Villars nevertheless struggles to defend himself against her natural maternal claims to authority over her granddaughter, and Evelina remains caught between these 'two masters.'

Burney thus articulates a particularly Humean theory of national identity. David Hume spent 1747-8 agonizing over whether to publish 'Of the Protestant Succession' in a new edition of *Essays Moral and Political.*[38] Though he was at pains to point out that the House of Hanover had been settled, the memory of the Jacobite uprising of 1745 and the fear of being labelled a sympathizer was, Harris argues, enough to discourage him.[39] Meanwhile, Hume extended his term as St Clair's secretary for an embassy to Vienna and Turin. By the time they reached Turin, peace had settled, and they returned home six weeks after the treaty of Aix La Chappelle was signed on the 18th October 1748. It was his travels through Europe, Harris posits, that caused him to return to the subject of 'what determines the peculiar manners and particular qualities of a nation.' [40] 'Of National Characters', published in late November 1748, took a hierarchical, social view, noting that 'the human mind is of a very imitable nature,' and therefore 'it is [not] possible for any set of men to converse often together without acquiring a similitude of manners and communication to each other their vices as well as their virtues':

> … in every society the ingredients of industry and indolence, valour and cowardice, humanity and brutality, wisdom and folly, will be mixed after the same manner. In the infancy of society, if any of these dispositions be found in greater abundance than the rest, it will naturally prevail in the composition, and give a tincture to the national character. […] yet surely the persons in credit and authority, being still a more contracted body, cannot always be presumed to be of the same character; and their influence on the manners of the people, must, at all times, be very considerable.[41]

He utterly rejects the 'the influence of air or climate,' and instead 'discover[s] every where a sympathy or contagion of manners,' that is little more than 'accidents' that cause one nation

[37] Lemmings, *Law and Government in England,* 4.
[38] David A. Harris, *Hume: An Intellectual Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 240-1.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Harris, *Hume,* 242.
[41] David Hume, 'Of National Characters,' *Political Essays,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 82.

to differ from another.[42] Hume's view that national characters risked contagion can be found most strongly in Burney's third novel *Camilla*. But it is also implicit in Villars' fears lest Duval reach Evelina before socialisation in London can inoculate her. Evelina must learn how to read the social fabric in such a way that she rejects her grandmother in favour of her guardian and guardian's friend. Yet the possibility of such infection unsettles the claims to natural social order which underpin both Captain Mirvan and Reverend Villars' assertion of authority. If ritual socialisation and violence are required to mould acceptably discrete Britishness, then as Evelina and Villars are aware, the Duval model with its naked celebration of family ties and European influences carries an equal, if not greater, legitimacy.

Yet it is not Evelina or Sir John Belmont, but her grandmother Madame Duval who suffers the brunt of this social opprobrium. Shortly after her arrival in London Evelina and her party – Captain Mirvan, his wife Mrs Mirvan, and their daughter Miss Mirvan – are waiting for a carriage to take them home 'after a night at the Fantoccini' when 'a tall elderly woman brushed quickly past us, calling out, "My God, what shall I do?"[43] Mrs Mirvan proposes to take the 'well-dressed' woman, 'in England only two days', who 'has lost [her] company,' into the carriage, as: 'She is quite alone, and a foreigner-' 'She's never the better for that,' answered he: 'she may be a woman of the town, for any thing you know.' [44] Though the Captain is pointedly forced to acquiesce to the oppositional Christian logic of his wife, 'we shall but follow the golden rule, if we carry to her to her lodgings,' they soon argue, with the Captain demanding to know why she went 'to a public place without an Englishman.'[45] She brusquely replies that she 'think[s] the English a parcel of brutes' as 'there's no nation under

[42] This is directly opposed to Hester Thrale's theory. Having damned those who hurry 'from place to place', she argues that such a flitting between countries leads to a direct rejection of the universality of God's laws:

> they learn to think virtue and vice ambulatory, as Browne says; profess that climate and constitution regulate man's actions, till they try to persuade their companions into a belief most welcome to themselves, that the will of God in one place is by no means his will in another and most resemble in their whirling fancies a boy's top [where one side was blue, the other red etc] I once saw shewn by a professor who read us a lecture upon optics. […] who, whipping it merrily about, obtained as a general effect the total privation of all four colours, so distinct at the beginning of its tour; - it resembled a dirty white!

Hester Lynch Piozzi, *Observations and Reflections Made in the Course of a Journey Through France, Italy, and Germany* in two vols. Vol 2. (London: T. Cadell, 1789), 386 – 8.

[43] Burney, *Evelina*, 51.
[44] Burney, *Evelina*, 51.
[45] Burney, *Evelina*, 51-2.

the sun can beat the English for ill-politeness.'[46] At this point, Captain Mirvan and the rest of his party are still unaware that the woman is Madame Duval.[47] Yet the Captain, in rather brusquer nationalist tones, shares the neat patriarchal logic espoused by Villars. Any 'well-dressed woman' alone in a public place without a male presence, especially a 'foreigner' without a regulatory English male presence, must be a prostitute. Although the Captain speaks to Duval, he might as well be setting out the risks of Evelina's situation: like her grandmother, she is 'without an Englishman', alone in the public sphere and with only the most tenuous of links to a guardian who may at any time rid himself of her. Unowned, unanchored in English society, Duval's body is dangerously purchasable by the town and in its availability unsettles the position of other women. If Villars writes the theory of womanhood, Mirvan's role in the novel is to instil and enforce its binary assumptions over and above Duval's legitimatist anarchism.

Madame Duval's troublingly fluid nationality is a constant source of anxiety for the male characters. In Villars' biography of Evelina's family, he emphasises his own contribution, peppering his account with personal pronouns:

> I had the honour to accompany Mr. Evelyn, the grandfather of my young charge, when upon his travels, in capacity of tutor. His unhappy marriage, immediately upon his return to England, with Madame Duval, then a waiting-girl at a tavern, contrary to the advice and entreaties of all his friends, among whom I was myself the most urgent to dissuade him, induced him to abandon his native land, and fix his abode in France. […] He survived this ill-judged marriage but two years.[48]

Madame Duval then married Monsieur Duval, and it was at his instigation that the former Mrs Evelyn 'tyrannically, endeavoured to effect a union between Miss Evelyn and one of his nephews,' which pushed her into a hasty marriage with Sir John Belmont in an effort to

---

[46] Burney, *Evelina*, 52

[47] Simon Macdonald notes that:

> The performances at the Italian opera in London of the singer Caterina Gabrielli, seconded by her sister Francesca, had been the subject of close attention among the Burneys in the mid-1770s. Frances Burney wrote a detailed description of a family outing, which included 'Bessy Allen', to see Gabrielli perform in 1775, and Dr Burney recorded that 'the most memorable musical event' of that season in London had been Gabrielli's arrival.

It is plausible, to see links between Madame Duval's arrival here, in the novel of 1778, and a reference to 'Bessy Allen' via the trip to the theatre in 1775.
Simon Macdonald, 'Identifying Mrs Meeke: Another Burney Family Novelist' *The Review of English Studies*, 64 (2013), 367 – 385, 377.

[48] Burney, *Evelina*, 15.

escape.[49] By the time she arrives in England, Monsieur Duval is no more, and she is instead accompanied by Monsieur Du Bois.[50] Despite Captain Mirvan's certain dismissal of the women as a 'foreigner' and 'Mrs Frog' then, Madame Duval's nationality is curiously opaque. While some critics have made Captain Mirvan's error,[51] it is curious that it is the supposedly naïve voice of Evelina whose first impression is one of indeterminacy. 'There was,' she said, 'something foreign in her accent, though it was difficult to discover whether she was an English or a French woman.'[52] Evelina's naïve voice reveals a biographical truth which Captain Mirvan cannot allow to be uttered: if it is possible to change nationality as one might change clothing, then his neat, naturalised, gendered dichotomy between immoral France and moral Britishness falls apart. Not only does this scene reveal what is at stake for Evelina, but it also underscores her radically transgressive witness to her grandmother's suffering for revealing the poly-national influences on character and identity.

For all his derisive cries of 'Mrs Frog' however, it is this fluidity rather than a French identity that most threatens the Captain. Mirvan and Duval's argument in the carriage only intensifies when Duval claims to be acquainted with Lady Howard. The Captain suggests she must be a washer woman, to which Duval retorts he must have 'no eyes':

> did you ever see a wash-woman in such a gown as this?
> […]
> "Dirty fellow!" exclaimed the Captain, seizing both her wrists, "hark you, Mrs. Frog, you'd best hold your tongue; for I must make bold to tell you, if you don't, that I shall make no ceremony of tripping you out of the window, and there you may lie in the mud till some of your Monseers come to help you out of it." [53]

'Moi foi,' she swears, 'I'll go to Justice Fielding about you; I'm a person of fashion, and I'll make you know it, or my name a'n't Duval.' Evelina promptly faints. That Captain Mirvan is able to read her well enough to discern without benefit of her biography that she was born in the lower classes, yet falsely reads her as French where even her granddaughter comprehends a fuzzy national identity, is implausible. Instead, Captain Mirvan punishes not a French national identity that is intrinsically immoral, but instead attempts to imprint and enforce a

[49] Ibid.
[50] Burney, *Evelina*, 58.
[51] Janice Farrar Thaddeus rightly noted the transgression of class in Duval's first marriage, yet misses the shared nationality, arguing Mr. Evelyn married a 'french waiting girl at a tavern.' Thaddeus, *Frances Burney: A Literary Life*, 34.
[52] Burney, *Evelina*, 51.
[53] Burney, *Evelina*, 52-3.

neat national and moral dichotomy between England and France where none exists. In so doing, he hopes to erase the troubling evidence that it is possible to be born in England, a 'waiting girl in a tavern' and end up a French 'person of fashion.'[54]

With Dror Wahrman suggesting that this shift towards an essentialist conception of identity began after the American War of Independence, Duval's absence from England becomes critical; there is no hint that she has returned from France since her marriage to Mr Evelyn, at least thirty years ago. Madame Duval has therefore returned to a substantially different England, with a profoundly different ideological landscape. Her claims to be a 'person of fashion' who knows 'Justice Fielding' count for nothing. Indeed, as Justice Fielding's brother Henry jibed in 1752, people of fashion were "people whose essence consisteth in appearances, and who, while they seem to be something, are really nothing."[55] This is not just comically ridiculous, but dangerous: while this might have been the height of acceptability in the 1750s, in the 1770s such fluidity would, as Mirvan's supposition that her gown intrinsically changes her to a person of fashion shows, have been dangerous in its flagrant refutation of Villars' and Mirvans' discourse of natural, national qualities. Duval's unsettling claims to Justice Fielding are not just ridiculous therefore, but dangerous in her radically egalitarian claims to justice and anarchic in its implicit disruption of historical progress.

Madame Duval, however, believes Captain Mirvan's taunts to be hypocritically rooted in class. Shortly after her ill-treatment in the Mirvan's carriage, Evelina's unwanted suitor Sir Clement joins the Captain's taunts. Infuriated, Duval demands to know 'Pray, Sir, was you ever in Paris?' He bows, yet Duval presses on:

> "I thought you would like it, Sir, because you look so like a gentleman. As to the Captain, and as to that other gentleman, why they may very well not like what they don't know: for I suppose, Sir, you was never abroad?"
> "Only three years, Ma'am," answered Sir Clement, drily.
> "Well, that's very surprising! I should never have thought it: however, I dare say you only kept company with the English."

[54] Further evidence comes from his comparative dismissal of her partner, Monsieur Du Bois. When M. Du Bois is introduced to the Captain in Letter XVI of Vol. I, he is 'gloomy' and utters a few 'sarcasm[s]' but since Du Bois 'speaks no English, and understands it so imperfectly,' he more or less ignores him in favour of Duval for the rest of the novel.
[55] Henry Fielding, *The Covent Garden Journal*, no. 37. Quoted in Julie Park, *The Self and It: Novel Objects in Eighteenth-Century England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010), 37.

> "Why, pray, who should he keep company with?" cried the Captain: "what I suppose you'd have him ashamed of his own nation, like some other people not a thousand miles off, on purpose to make his own nation ashamed of him?" [56]

Yet Paris for Duval is where Mirvan would become 'quite another person.' He would learn: 'to be more politer, Sir, and not to talk to ladies in such a rude, old-fashioned way as this […] Why there isn't a hairdresser, nor a shoemaker, nor nobody, that wouldn't blush to be in your company.' 'Politeness,' as Lawrence Klein sums up, theoretically functioned both as 'an idiom for a wide range of people,' from many different social classes and expressed in myriad ways, yet nevertheless cohered 'as a medium facilitating interaction and access to shared experience.'[57] It was not just conversation which could be gentle. [58] As Alun Withey has recently demonstrated, bodies themselves could become 'polite', with 'gentle' behaviour accessible not just to the gentry but a more comprehensive selection of the bourgeois nation[59] Duval (mis)understands politeness to function as a natural extension of *ancien regime* identity, as a new social credit available to anybody. Anybody, from any religion and any social class may learn to be 'gentle' and mix in the 'fashion[able] world.' Madame Duval, then, believes Captain Mirvan judges her nothing more than a frenchified 'washerwoman.' Yet as her appeal to Sir Clement and Lord Orville's time in France demonstrates, this is not just 'rude' in its deference to 'old-fashioned' hierarchies swept away by polite sociability but hypocritical. Despite Mirvan's proclamations, everybody knew a French education was foundational to polite and aristocratic identity alike. Sir Clement and Lord Orville had spent 'three years' or more in France learning to become 'gentlemen,' and they had not suffered Mirvan's taunts.

Captain Mirvan therefore struggles to assert a bellicose conception of national identity against the sociable cosmopolitanism which permeated fashionable life. As Tim Hitchcock and Michele Cohen argue 'English gentlemen had to look to women and the French' to learn the polite conversation which was 'a dominant ideal of behaviour for both sexes' in the

---

[56] Burney, *Evelina*, 62.
[57] Lawrence E Klein, 'Politeness and the Interpretation of the British Eighteenth Century,' *The Historical Journal* Vol 45. No. 4 (December 2002), 869 – 898, 873.
[58] For a contemporary source which views politeness not solely as something to be learned or enacted, 'but that temper of mind and tenour of conduct which make persons easy in their behaviour [and] conciliating in their affections', Anonymous, 'An Essay on the Nature, Marks, and Principals of Politeness' *Universal Magazine*, December 1775.
[59] Alun Withey, *Technology, Self Fashioning, and Politeness in Eighteenth-Century Britain: Refined Bodies* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 43.

eighteenth century.[60] While the continent was always accessible to those with means, after the treaty of Aix-La-Chappelle an explosion in travel guides instructed eager readers how to discover France on the cheap.[61] If contemporary British identity is formed in dialectic with Catholic France however, it becomes correspondingly difficult to rationalise distinct national qualities. Captain Mirvan himself reveals the unsettling promises of donning polite identity, taking Duval's statement that 'they'd make quite another person out of you' by learning to be 'more politer' quite literally, as he demands to know whether:

> 'you'd have me to learn to cut capers? – and dress like a monkey? – and palaver in French gibberish? – hey would you? – and Powder, and daub, and make myself up, like some other folks.'[62]

Captain Mirvan attempts to make the concept of learning to be French ridiculous. It would be impossible, he claims, for a full-blooded Briton such as himself to 'learn to cut capers' and 'palaver in French gibberish.' Yet he fails to answer Duval's implicit question. Indeed, in suggesting that to be French is a matter of learning a set of behaviours and affectations he paradoxically denies any essentialist national difference. In so doing, he leaves himself open to a conception of Hanoverian polite identity little more than consumption and performance.

The radical implications of this do not go unnoticed by Evelina. In one of her first letters from London, Evelina excitedly relates how she and Miss Mirvan pleaded with Mrs Mirvan to allow them to visit Drury Lane theatre. 'Her chief objection was to our dress, for we have had no chance to *Londonize* ourselves […] we are to sit in some obscure place, that she may not be seen.'[63] Yet with a 'private ball' two days later, the process cannot be put off for long:

> We have been a shopping, as Mrs Mirvan calls it, all this morning, to buy silks, caps, gauzes, and so forth. The shops are really very entertaining, especially the mercers; there seem to be six or seven men belonging to each shop […] At the milliners, the ladies we met were so much dressed, that I should rather have imagined they were

[60] Tim Hitchcock and Michele Cohen, 'introduction', in Hitchcock and Cohen, eds *English Masculinities, 1660 – 1800* (Harlow: Addison, Wesley, Longman, 1999), 1 – 22, 20.
[61] The naval officer Phillip Playstowe's *Gentleman's Guide* of 1768 was one such example. As well as urging fellow officers to save money by wearing their uniforms and mixing with the French officer class – who, he claimed, would welcome them with open arms – he advised travellers to pause in Amiens. There, they could take French lessons via the monastery at a very reasonable rate before they arrived in Paris, where it is too easy to congregate amongst Englishmen and avoid speaking French.
Philip Playstowe, *A Gentleman's Guide in His Tour Through France, Wrote by an Officer* (London: G. Kearsly, 1768), 5, 24, 26.
[62] Burney, *Evelina*, 62.
[63] Burney, *Evelina*, 27.

> making visits than purchases. But what most diverted me was, that we were more frequently served by men than by women! And such men! So finical, so affected! They seemed to understand every part of a woman's dress better than we do ourselves; and they recommended caps and ribands with an air of so much importance, that I wished to ask them how long they had left off wearing them! [64]

Wahrman argued that 'the anonymity of the large city, together with the abundance of shopping opportunities it offered, allowed people to don and doff identities with impunity.'[65] Burney's example however points not to necessity of donning, rather than doffing. The choice between which identity to don and which to relinquish is not one that can be easily made by the subject. While 'ideas and state power' require 'material things' to be realised, the materiality of the silk's sensory experience create the very social classes represented in that ideology.[66] This was risky. For 'if clothing was in one sense the anchor of identity' it also pointed to 'the mutable and non-essential nature of what can be assumed or shed at will.'[67] The answer to this tension lies in the trip to the theatre.[68] As Mrs Mirvan baldly stated, Evelina has to be 'Londonized' – that is, given the proper patriarchal-designated clothes - before she can be exposed to the public gaze of the theatre. This act of Benthamite surveillance radically unsticks the distinction between actor and audience and naturalises the purchases made at the milliners.[69] Burney therefore represents polite identity as a theatrical and commercial material culture, a constant exchange between changing room and stage with men acting as stockroom assistants, ushers, and theatre managers who refuse to acknowledge the presence of the stage – but reserve the right to lift the curtain and reorder the players.

It comes as no surprise that Burney was intimately familiar with Fantoccini and the theatres her heroine visits. One of the most popular, Julie Parks explains, was Carlo Perico's marionette theatre, which 'starred harlequin puppets that dined from plates of macaroni onstage,' and attracted audiences from Johnson, Reynolds, Goldsmith, and Burke that

---

[64] Burney, *Evelina*, 29.
[65] Wahrman, 203.
[66] Timothy LeCain, *The Matter of History: How Things Create the Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 56, 192.
[67] Wahrman, 178.
[68] Burney notably struggled with myopia, which led in turn to social embarrassments. Harman points to two main incidents, the first in 1773 when she was unable to see the actresses on stage during a trip to the theatre, the second during her time at court when she was unable to see the King and Queen in time to respond appropriately. Harman, *Fanny Burney*, 70.
[69] See for example: Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* trans: Alan Sheridan, (London: Penguin, 1977), 200,

intersected with the Burney circle; indeed, they 'set a metaphorical standard for both social artifice and the invisible mechanics of human behaviour.[70] While these Fantoccini were often performed around Haymarket,[71] they also took place in the Haymarket theatre itself.[72] Burney understood the relationship between puppetry, theatre, and the 'social artifice' of womanhood.[73] As Evelina learns, a visit to the theatre is not just a social occasion to be seen, but a performance almost indistinguishable from the actors on the stage. One must perform womanhood without being seen to perform it; to be 'londonised' is to play one's role flawlessly without even acknowledging there a role is being played. Or, indeed, that one's grandmother was a washerwoman. Londonisation is consequently filled with danger. As Mrs Mirvan and Villars comment, there is a risk in seeing the mechanics of the world 'as it really is,' with Villars listing 'new […] scene of life in which you are engaged! – balls – plays – operas - ridottos!' while worrying how Evelina will 'bear the change? My heart trembles for your future tranquility.'[74]

Madame Duval is particularly problematic for the Captain, then, because she revels in the anarchic logic of politeness. Burney, Wenner suggests, 'was always fascinated by theatre,' and metaphors of theatricality throughout her novels are represented best by the 'transvestite

---

[70] Julie Park, *The Self and It: Novel Objects in Eighteenth-Century England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010), 170.

[71] Richard Altick describes 'One signor Grimani […] exhibited a model of London and Westminster at the Fantoccini Room, Panton Street, Haymarket, in 1774' (Richard Daniel Altick, *The Shows of London,* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1978), 115,) suggesting that fantoccinis took place in specialised spaces within London itself.

[72] See for example, *The Gentleman's Magazine,* Vol 92, part 1; volume 131, May 1822, 407, which describes how in January 1777, over a year before Evelina's publication, 'The Italian fantoccini represented Comedies, Dancing, and pantomimic Transformations' at the Haymarket under Mr Foote's lease of the theatre;

See also *Playbill of Haymarket Theatre, announcing a new exhibition and various entertainments,* source: bodjjo005-ahf-0001-0, Bodleian library.

[73] The Burney family were well aware of the puppetry metaphor for social artifice, as an amusing letter from Maria Allen – Elizabeth's eldest daughter – to Frances shows:

> Now hetty's letters and your papa's lord, why they are common entertaining lively witty Letter such as Dr Swift might write or people who prefer the beautiful to the sublime, but you now! Why I dare say will talk of Corporeal machines, negation fluid, matter, and motion, and all those pretty things Well Well fanny's letters for my money – I like your plan immensely of extirpating that vile race of beings called man but I (who you know am clever (VEEREE) clever) have thought of an improvement in the system suppose we were to cut off their prominent members? And by that means render them harmless innofencive little creatures; we might have such charming vocal music every house might be qualified to set up an opera and piccini's music might still be more in vogue than it is and we might make such useful animals of them in other respects. [sic]

This of course also points to the presence of castrati in the Burney household.
Maria Allen to Frances Burney, c1768 Lars E. Troide, ed. *The Early Journals and Letters of Frances Burney,* Vol 1. (McGill-Queens University Press: Kingston and Montreal, 1988), appendix 3.

[74] Burney, *Evelina,* 57.

"larger than life" stage dame' persona of Madame Duval.[75] Duval does not just play her part badly, but rather flaunts a class transvestitism that draws unwanted attention to the instability and theatricality of eighteenth-century identity. It can be no coincidence that one of her first sentences in the novel is a demand to know whether Captain Mirvan had ever seen 'a wash-woman in such a gown as this?' For the out of date Duval, this is proof she's 'no such mean person,' and 'as good as Lady Howard, and as rich too.'[76] While Straub sees this as further proof that while Duval 'follows the rules of Parisian fashion, she breaks so many basic guidelines for female politeness that it seems unnecessary to catalogue them,' this misses Burney's much more radical point.[77] For Duval the distinctions of class, gender and nation are as simple as purchasing fashionable clothing, slipping on a dress, and playing a part. For Mirvan, however, her flagrant transgression of 'so many basic guidelines' does not just draw attention to the artifice of 'female politeness,' but the contradictions of his national chauvinism. If learning how to be 'polite' means learning how to 'powder, and daub, and make[s oneself] up' to 'palaver in French gibberish' then where, Burney again asks, does Britishness end and French 'palaver' begin?[78] What, too, is the difference between Evelina's Londonisation and her grandmother's social climbing and national anarchy? Such questions are troubling: for if social classes are mere rules, and gender a matter of clothing and learned behaviour, then what legitimates male political authority?

The answer is autocratic violence. After repeated failed attempts to get Duval to 'hold [her] tongue,' Captain Mirvan forges a letter, apparently 'signed by a clerk of a country justice; who acquainted her' that her partner Monsieur Du Bois had been arrested for treason. While Evelina and her grandmother rush to Du Bois' aid, Captain Mirvan and Sir Clement disguise themselves as highwaymen and attack their carriage. Restrained by Sir Clement during the assault, Evelina finally discovers her grandmother in a terrible state:

> sobbing, nay, almost roaring, and in the utmost agony of rage and terror. As soon as she saw me, she redoubled her cries; but her voice was so broken, I could not understand a word she said. [She was bound by the feet] yet so forlorn, so miserable a figure, I never before saw her. Her head-dress had fallen off, her linen was torn, her negligee had not a pin left in it, her petticoats she was obliged to hold on, and her shoes were perpetually slipping off. She was covered with dirt, weeds, and filth, and

[75] Barbara Britton Wenner, *Prospect and Refuge in the Landscape of Jane Austen* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 17-8.
[76] Burney, *Evelina*, 52-3.
[77] Straub, *Divided Fictions*, 31.
[78] Burney, *Evelina*, 62.

> her face was really horrible; for the pomatum and powder from her head, and the dust from the road, were quite pasted on her skin by her tears, which, with her rouge, made so frightful a mixture, that she hardly looked human.[79]

This is a meticulous and anarchic reversal of Evelina's Londonisation and the commercial trappings of politeness. The universe of clothes, make-up, and jewellery into which Evelina was instructed in the milliners is here repeated only to be inverted. Consumer sociability may promise radical possibilities for common identity, but this comes at the cost of a deeper precarity. The servants want to laugh but remain only 'ready to die with laughter', and the footman is forced to 'fi[x] his eyes on the ground, as if fearful of again trusting himself to look at her.' Duval is not returned to the servant class but cast outside the polite social order entirely. No longer legible, she is beyond even the sustaining if painful possibility of laughter and sight. The accoutrements which once granted polite identity now only render her monstrous, 'hardly […] human.' Mirvan has stepped onto the stage and disrupted the natural surveillance and supposedly abstract mechanisms of the fashionable market. Just as the milliners can create a woman from countless fabrics, so too can that material culture be stripped at whim.

The moderate claims of Hanoverian sociability thus belie a more autocratic state. Despite the letter's focus on Du Bois it is Madame Duval's social and commercial transgressions that are compared with treason. Evelina was immediately suspicious about the letter stating that Du Bois was 'upon trial for suspicion of treasonable practices against the government.' 'When I heard the letter,' she writes 'I was quite amazed at its success. So improbable did it seem, that a foreigner should be taken before a country justice of the peace, for a crime of so dangerous a nature, that I cannot imagine how Madame Duval could be alarmed'.[80] Yet it is not the foreigner Du Bois who is Mirvan's target. He cares little for a French subject who has no claims to Englishness. It is Madame Duval's transgressions which require punishment. Just like Sir John Belmont, who is able to annul supposedly immutable family relationships through destroying a certificate of marriage, Captain Mirvan's ability to co-opt the legal system reveals a patriarchal state terrifyingly bloody in its autocratic potential. The law remains embodied in those with and close to power, who here are overwhelmingly Protestant

[79] Burney, *Evelina*, 149 – 50.
[80] Ibid.

men. Madame Duval understands the danger. Penalties for treason were severe. Duval has spent the last several hundred pages loudly declaiming her national difference, hatred of the English, and preference for France as she attempts to prove her fashionable place in an expansive British society that she believed depended less on the vagaries of birth and more on possession of, and participation in, social capital. Yet as Bridget M. Marshall notes 'official justice', was unpredictable 'and subject to the whims of local practitioners.'[81] 'In England', moreover, 'the accused felon was not allowed a complete defence with witnesses and council until 1836.'[82] As far as Duval, who has had ample proof of Mirvan's influence, was concerned, there was a real and constant danger of arrest.

This is particularly important as Madame Duval is heavily implied to be an English Catholic. The most obvious marker of her Catholicism is her loud preference for a French education for her daughters. As Colin Haydon notes, 'Catholics […] were often educated in colleges abroad', most often at the English colleges in Paris, where 'they may well have acquired traces of foreign manners (even perhaps, the hint of an accent).' [83] In at least some cases this went, Haydon explains, much further than 'the hint of an accent', with Whittaker's *An History of the Original Parish of Whalley* remarking that the Douai-educated antiquarian Charles Townley (1735 – 1805) had lost English fluency, 'and had frequent recourse to French and Italian words.'[84] Madame Duval, as ever, does not help matters. She loudly and awkwardly proclaims her 'foi' in a potentially Catholic 'dieu' in response to a captain with 'fixed and prejudiced hatred of whatever is not English.' While her awkward grammar may point to her lower-class origins it also broadcasts a greater comfort in the French language and therefore religion. Yet for Madame Duval, this is less than a problem. Like her belief that it is her 'dress' that makes her a 'woman of fashion,' French fluency to the point of a loss of fluency in one's maternal language only further reifies her newfound gentle status in her own eyes. It is Captain Mirvan who is impolite for pointing out her origins and whispering about her faith, and it is he that logically speaking should be excluded from society as out of date at best, and dangerously autocratic – and perhaps even Stuart - at worst.

---

[81] Bridget M. Marshall, *The Transnational Gothic Novel and the Law, 1790- - 1860* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 46.
[82] Marshall, *Transnational Gothic Novel*, 19.
[83] Colin Haydon 'I Love My King and My Country, but a Roman Catholic I Hate: Anti-Catholicism, Xenophobia and National Identity in Eighteenth-Century England.' in Tony Claydon and Ian McBride (Eds.) *Protestantism and National Identity*: *Britain and Ireland, c1650 – 1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp 33 – 52, 36.
[84] Haydon, 'I love my king and my country…' 36, note 18, referring to T.D Whittaker, *An History of The Original Parish of Whalley* (1818).

Evelina is therefore obsessed with the presence of Catholics in society. As Gabriel Glickman has persuasively argued, despite the legal barriers in place after the 1688 revolution, 'discharg[ing] the patrician duties of sociability and hospitality', especially in urban centres, allowed 'recusant squires' who 'rejected devotional seclusion' the opportunity to 'shad[e] into the larger hinterland of a gentry [which] was becoming more homogenous.'[85] This growing presence in society brought ecumenical family connections to light. The enduring friendship of the Throckmortons with the Pakington family, Glickman asserts, 'in Warwickshire offered a reminder that many Tory Gentry possessed a recusant lineage.'[86] Despite those that claimed devotional and monarchical purity then, the catholic past was awkwardly present in the mixed spaces of polite society. The exclusion and othering of English Catholics and Stuart legitimacy became an almost impossible task, though not, as this chapter argues, for lack of trying. In one of the few explorations of national identity in *Evelina*, Leanne Manau argues that that Madame Duval 'represents the threat of a dual national identity, of being both French and English' and that Evelina finds this 'horrifying.'[87] Yet this is not quite true. Madame Duval, like other 'recusants' is politely if awkwardly welcomed into most of society. Reverend Villars wishes to quash her influence and wishes she would conform or at least return to France. It is only Captain Mirvan's repeated attacks that 'terrified' Evelina, who pronounces them 'cruel.'[88] If Evelina finds her grandmother awkward, she also vocally defends her legitimacy as she angrily details Mirvan's atrocities and struggles to repress her own outraged voice. In so doing, Burney defends the Catholic histories of England and argues that they are – or should be - more than welcome in Modern Britain. *Evelina* is therefore not just a novel of manners or education, but a novel of how polite identity educates young subjects out of their Catholic families and into sociable Anglican identity. In pointing to the trauma of such a demand, Burney guardedly expresses her own dual-identity, as a loyal Anglican woman, but also as a proud inheritor of a Catholic past and present.

[85] Gabriel Glickman, *The English Catholic Community, 1688 – 1745: Politics, Culture, and Ideology* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), 63.
[86] Glickman, *The English Catholic Community,* 63-4
[87] Leanne Maunu, *Women Writing the Nation: National Identity, Female Community, and the British French connection, 1770 – 1820* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2007), 44. Maunu argues that Burney's attitude towards nationalism and the stereotypes on which it relied were ambivalent at best in *Evelina*, and that a stronger sympathy, developed only with her marriage to a French roman catholic émigré general and decade in France, found its sole literary expression in *The Wanderer.*
[88] Burney, *Evelina,* 52-3

It is particularly interesting, then, that Sir John Belmont gives the child he believes to be Evelina a Catholic education. When Evelina and Lord Orville attempt to gain her father's recognition, Sir John greets their messenger 'with the utmost politeness,' but dismisses their claims that Evelina had been switched at birth as 'that ridiculous old story.':

> For some time this assertion appeared so absurd, that I only laughed at it: but, at last, he assured me, I had myself been imposed upon; for that very woman who attended Lady Belmont in her last illness, conveyed the child to him while he was in London, before she was a year old. 'Unwilling,' he added, 'at that time to confirm the rumour of my being married, I sent the woman with the child to France: as soon as she was old enough, I put her into a convent, where she has been properly educated, and now I have taken her home. I have acknowledged her for my lawful child, and paid, at length, to the memory of her unhappy mother a tribute of fame, which has made me wish to hide myself hereafter from all the world.' [89]

This seems to neuter Duval's French education and corroborate her claims of aristocratic hypocrisy. Villars' terror of a Parisian, Catholic education withers against how the pointedly morally reformed Sir John Belmont would have made even more explicitly Catholic choices. Yet as we have seen, despite Villars' and Mirvan's claims the moral threat stems not from France – where, after all, the middling classes and up learned to be 'polite' – nor from what Burney called Madame Duval's 'vulgar connections', but rather from Madame Duval's intrinsically transgressive presence. After all, despite – and indeed because of - Mirvan's attempts, she demonstrates the intrinsic fluidity of identity, and its contingency on socially learned, rather than intrinsic, qualities. It is this that Captain Mirvan must deny in order to legitimate his own authority over women, Catholics, the French, and the lower orders. *Evelina*, then, is Burney's radical description of the imposition of British Womanhood as a sectarian, xenophobic, and unnatural patriarchal identity that hides behind and abuses the legal system to legitimize its brutal attempts to the exclusion of familial bonds and maternal influence.

The motif of the switched infant here would have carried particularly risky connotations for the contemporary reader. Many of James II's subjects had long feared his Catholic tendencies. After having lost his first wife in 1671, the then Duke of York's remarriage in 1673 to the Italian Catholic Mary of Modena did nothing to assuage their concerns. Yet while Mary bore several children, none survived infancy by the time James II ascended the throne

[89] Burney, *Evelina,* 366.

in 1685, and his subjects became reasonably certain any Catholic influence on the nation would be tempered by his lack of male heir. When Mary finally did give birth to a son in 1688, rumours of illegitimacy quickly multiplied. The 'warming-pan scandal' focused on the contested testimony of Margaret Dawson, a midwife, whose oath she 'saw fire carried into the Queen's Room in a Warming-Pan':

> enabled an extraordinary allegation: that the new prince was not the issue of his mother, but a common child born in a convent adjacent to St James's Palace, smuggled into the building via a series of secret passages and finally into the queen's bed, inside the conveniently covered and roughly newborn-sized warming-pan mentioned by Dawson.[90]

The argument rested as to whether, when the midwife said she saw 'fire' she meant coals within the pan, or used 'fire' as a shorthand for the warming pan itself. In so doing, McTague argues, the debates around the warming pan as sign or signified mirrored debates about the nature of the eucharist, with Catholics in the Protestant imagination, unable to tell the difference between the signifier and the signified.[91] Hence their confusion between the icon and the saint, and the bread and the real presence. While the baby switched at birth trope is hardly novel – indeed, it goes back to Plautus - to post 1688 literature, the fact that Burney uses Evelina's social and familial identity as a lens through which to tackle questions of legitimacy and sociable legibility makes a deliberate reference to the Stuarts here all the more plausible.

While Burgess argues Burney is fundamentally sceptical about the value of sentiment and regretful of the passing of 'tory equations of birth with worth,' *Evelina* resolves through a cri du sang, that is a 'voice of blood' which resolves gothic and romance narratives by re-establish[ing fractured] families and lineages.'[92] This in turn suggests a potentially Jacobite sympathy on Burney's part.[93] Despite Sir John Belmont's scoffing denial, Mrs Selwyn persists. If, she claims, he is certain the child he has raised is his, then he can have no objection to seeing this young lady.

---

[90] John McTague, 'Anti-Catholicism, Incorrigibility and Credulity in the Warming-Pan Scandal of 1688-9', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* Vol. 36 No. 3 (2013), 433 – 448, 433.
[91] Ibid.
[92] Perry, *Novel Relations*, 98, 399.
[93] Burgess, *British Fiction*, 73.

> ‘Come forth, then, my dear,’ cried she, opening the door; ‘come forth and see your father. Then, taking my trembling hand, she led me forward. […] What a moment for your Evelina-an involuntary scream escaped me, and, covering my face with my hands, I sunk on the floor. He had, however, seen me first; for, in a voice scarce articulate, he exclaimed, "My God! does Caroline Evelyn still live!" […] "Lift up thy head-if my sight has not blasted thee!-lift up thy head, thou image of my long lost Caroline!" [94]

Evelina’s legitimacy is resolved through her clear accession to a maternal line of inheritance, that is her striking resemblance to her mother Caroline. Shortly before the cri du sang re-unites her with Sir John Belmont, it binds her to her half-brother MacCartney, as she proclaims they share a father: ‘I am your sister! […] we are not merely bound by the ties of friendship, but by those of blood. I feel for you, already, all the affection of a sister; I felt it, indeed, before I knew I was one.[95] It was this Cri Du Sang, Clark suggests, which helped to solidify James II’s claim to the throne, ‘since James denied his abdication, and since his son grew up to bear a clear resemblance to his father, Whig ideology was left looking like an evasion to disguise self-interest.’[96] Burney therefore asserts an awkwardly Stuart defence of paternal and royal authority and legitimacy. Yet it is clearly critical that she clarifies Stuart legitimacy within Humean terms that seeks to avoid a return to the violence of revolution. In other words, Sir John Belmont always has the intrinsic authority of fatherhood, but that authority equally depends on his acknowledgement of the ‘lawful’ duties. Evelina too claims a maternal inheritance, but a Catholic maternal inheritance that can be shaped and moderated within the boundaries of Anglican faithfulness.

The spectre of Jacobite authority and Hanoverian autocracy looms over the novel. As Colin Haydon has pointed out, returning soldiers and sailors ‘showed a notorious hatred of the Catholics, which not infrequently manifested itself in brutal horseplay or more serious violence.’ [97] Experience of Catholic enemies abroad, he argues, made them more likely to rush to identify ‘the enemy within,’ whether they were allies of foreign lands or the pretender.[98] Mirvan ‘delight[s] in terrifying and provoking’ Madame Duval.[99] Evelina

[94] Burney, *Evelina*, 372.
[95] Burney, *Evelina*, 363.
[96] Clark, *English Society*, 158.
[97] Colin Haydon, *Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth-Century England, C 1714-80: A Political and Social Study* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), 53-54.
[98] Ibid.
[99] Frances Burney, *Evelina*, ed by Edward A Bloom with an introduction and notes by Vivian Jones, (Oxford: Oxford World’s Classics, 2008), 154

pointedly comments Duval was growing 'irritated with the captain, for carrying his love of tormenting – *sport*, he calls it, to such barbarous and unjustifiable extremes.'[100] Captain Mirvan has just returned from an extended tour of duty, and is almost as alien to English society as Madame Duval. Mrs Mirvan, moreover, specifies that 'my daughter and the Captain have been separated almost seven years,' with his return causing 'joy, surprise, and consequently confusion.'[101] Captain Mirvan echoes this, bemoaning London's ridottos, and that 'he won't stay here to be smoked with filth any longer; but, having been seven years smoked with a burning sun, he will retire to the country.'[102] Vivien Jones points out that this was 'long, even by naval standards,' and that he could have been 'defending English interests in the Caribbean' or engaged in the first skirmishes of the American War of Independence.[103] Yet Burney's insistence of 'seven years' suggests, at the very least, she wanted to evoke the Seven Years War with France, between 1754 and 1763. It is, therefore, plausible that *Evelina* itself could be set closer to that period than its publication in 1778. If this is the case, the '45 rebellion and tang of the Jacobite threat would have been more prominent in Mirvan and his contemporaries' minds. If both Captain Mirvan and Madame Duval are in some senses out of step and time with contemporary society, then their awkward presence serves for Burney to puncture the moderate claims to liberty of late Hanoverian London.

Captain Mirvan's attack on Madame Duval moreover reveals the enduring importance of dress and material culture to loyalty. Jennifer Novotny has classified in detail how women incorporated symbols of Jacobite allegiance into their clothing. This ranged:

> from buttons to aprons to garters. […] items of personal dress offered a spectrum of obviousness for voicing a particular opinion. […] Even worn publicly, it required close attention to detail by an observer to note the decorative motif, and further insight to connect the simple flower with the Jacobite cause.[104]

In particular, 'women's needlework, an attestation of aesthetic taste, technical skill, and virtuous domesticity, was also a popular way to express opinions about divisive current

[100] Burney, *Evelina*, 152.
[101] Burney, *Evelina*, 24
[102] Burney, *Evelina*, 40.
[103] Vivien Jones, Note to page 24,' in Frances Burney, *Evelina* (Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 2008), 412.
[104] Jennifer Novotny, 'Polite War: Material Culture of the Jacobite Era; 1688 – 1790.' In Alan McInnes, Kieran German, and Lesley Graham (eds.) *Living with Jacobitism, 1690 – 1788* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2014), 153 – 172, 158.

events.'[105] As Duval refuses to either conform to patriarchal authority despite ever-increasing violence, or to the correct class apparel, her rebellion in Mirvan's eyes against patriarchal authority is inextricable from treason.[106] Captain Mirvan's assault, as Declan Kavanagh's work on suggests, must be seen as part of a much wider anxiety regarding the political possibilities of a fashionable material culture.[107] If learning how to be an Anglican Woman in the late eighteenth century was a matter of learning a new language of aestheticized material culture, then there remained a troubling possibility for other material cultures to endure at the very same time that Hanoverian material culture denied its own status as propaganda in favour of fashionable choice and moderate speech.

Indeed, Duval's oft-repeated gendered transgressions would have cemented her Jacobitism for contemporary readers. Carine Martin, writing on the heroine of the '45 rising Jeanie Cameron, suggests that what is most striking about her in Hanoverian propaganda 'is her blatant rebellion against social rules, most noticeably gender roles; her Jacobitism comes second, as if pushed into the background.'[108] Martin stresses the 'emotional nature of the relation of Jacobites to the Stuart family', with Hanoverians representing women as 'particularly prone to Jacobitism', a treason Addison compared to prostitution.[109] Duval, however, carries no traitorous letters, her clothes are embroidered with no Stuart codes, and though she returns from decades in France there is no evidence she returns at the vanguard of a new rising.[110] Burney thus asserts the dogged loyalty of British Catholics to a brutal

---

[105] Novotny, 'Polite War', 158.

[106] Emma Major suggests clothing itself marked religious difference in the early modern period. Duval suggests this clearly continued into the late 18c. *Madam Britannia,* 33-4.

[107]

> The period between the end of the seven years' war and Burke's speech to his electors in the mid 1770s was characterised by a new Imperial anxiety surrounding 'manliness and its antithesis, effeminacy,' spurred in part by returning soldiers. Burney therefore depicts the intensification of anti-Catholic sentiment as a cultural response to mid-century confessional warfare.

Declan Kavanagh, *Effeminate Years: Literature, Politics, and Aesthetics in mid Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2017), xii.

[108] Carine Martin 'Female rebels: The Female Figure in anti-Jacobite Propaganda' in Alan McInnes, Kieran German, and Lesley Graham (eds.) *Living with Jacobitism, 1690 – 1788* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2014), 85 – 98, 88.

[109] Martin, 'Female Rebels', 94.

[110]

> Jennie Batchelor points out that 'letter six and seven of [Samuel Richardson's] Pamela are dominated by lists of the heroine's newly acquired 'silks, laces.' Mr B inevitably and brutally tears and rips these clothes to shreds in search of compromising letters to her family to foil her escape'
> Jennie Batchelor, *Dress, Distress, and Desire: Clothing and the Female Body in Eighteenth-century Literature* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 26.

Hanoverian state that acts out the worst traditions of its Jacobite enemy. Just as Burney is at pains to unpick the Mirvan's links between Catholicism and Jacobitism, she equally confounds patriarchal links between gender norms and nationality; despite Captain Mirvan's best efforts, Madame Duval's outrageous impoliteness is not matched by immorality or treason. It is Captain Mirvan who constantly transgresses.

It is critical, therefore, that Burney pointedly evokes the masquerade in Duval's assault. As Sir Clement Willoughby first leaps into the carriage to restrain Evelina as Mirvan carries out the attack, he attempts to calm her: 'you cannot surely be alarmed, - do you not know me?'[111] This phrase is ripe with confessional shibboleths, as Evelina is asked – like Marguerite Dawson – to complete an epistemological test which would root her in Hanoverian theology of the Eucharist. Masquerades were inextricably bound up with wider rituals of knowing, inversions of class hierarchies, and rituals of masking and unmasking. These often involved

> set phrases – usually beginning "I know you" or "Do you know me?" […] to initiate conversation between masks. Watching a rake dressed as a "friar minor" at a masked assembly, the writer of the universal spectator for April 5, 1728, observed him "accost a Female in a Harlequin Habit, and with much eloquence, squeak out, *I know you.*[112]

Evelina first described the highwaymen as 'men in masks' before finally describing Captain Mirvan solely through the synecdoche of a 'mask.'[113] Sir Clement's attempt to calm Evelina is not just conducted through a simple act of recognition – an act of recognition which, considering his persistent and unwelcome attempts to woo her, would not at any rate have been reassuring – but rather an uncomfortable attempt to reassure her that this 'jape' has its own well-established parallels in the polite society to which she aspires to belong.

Sir Clement's claim however also contains an attempt to assert his own, older aristocratic identity and morality over and above that of Captain Mirvan. Masquerade narratives often involved not just 'women caught in compromising situations […] by male relatives' but also 'plots in which young women' are abducted and 'raped by unknown dominoes.'[114] Madame Duval's assault, as Thaddeus points out, is 'the picture of a woman raped.'[115] Sir Clement's

[111] Evelina, 147.
[112] Terry Castle, *Masquerade and Civilisation: The Carnivalesque in Eighteenth-Century Fiction* (London: Methuen, 1986), 35.
[113] Burney, *Evelina*, 147 - 8.
[114] Castle, *Masquerade and Civilisation*, 45.
[115] Thaddeus, *Frances Burney*, 46.

attempts to soothe Evelina, then, attempts to calm her fears of sexual assault from her attacker and acknowledges the constant threat of sexual assault that permeates these mixed spaces. Asking her to 'know' him however, he asks her to recognise not just his own moral probity and therefore her safety from attack, but in so doing, to reinscribe his own aristocratic identity over and above that of Mirvan. Yet his attempts to reinforce the old Tory equation of worth with birth do not just fail, but are as risible as Duval's own social claims. Not only was it the failure of Belmont's morality that placed Evelina in her situation in the first place, but Sir Clement repeatedly echoes Belmont's rakish behaviour. She first describes him as her 'persecutor' whose 'strange, provoking, and ridiculous conduct' – that is, his refusal to accept Evelina's rebuffs - intensifies to the point of faking a scandalous letter from her beloved Lord Orville in an attempt to seduce her. As Terry Castle's example suggests, Sir Clement's 'reassurance' that Evelina is not about to suffer a potentially sexual assault is itself an attempt at seduction. 'Costume in general was believed to instigate sexual digression,' Castle notes, and Sir Clement clearly hopes that by prompting Evelina to view this as a masque, she will throw off London's chastity and sleep with him. [116] Yet Sir Clement speaks these reassuring words while he 'held [her] fast' in his arms, removing – just as he always does – her inability to refuse him. In so doing, Burney refuses to confine the crimes of Captain Mirvan to one person, unable to control his own temper. The military, the aristocracy, the judiciary, the merchants, any arms of the Hanoverian state are all complicit – willing or not - in composing the social fabric licenced – if haltingly - by Reverend Villars.

Masquerades held a dubious moral position in eighteenth-century society. Terry Castle notes that the Bishop of London Edmund Gibson, preaching in 1724, saw links to machinations of the French ambassador, 'to enslave 'the Englishman' by encouraging in them 'licentiousness and effeminacy.'[117] His sermon was widely reprinted throughout the eighteenth century, and echoes Mirvan's anxieties of performance and national essences.[118] Jacobitism was equally carnivalesque. For Nicholas Rogers, it emerged from a 'world of oaths, portents, riddles, revels and anniversaries […] an often carnivalesque atmosphere of seditious laughter and ritual inversion.'[119] The very act of masking, then, would have been risky. Yet Captain Mirvan has gone further. He has not only masked himself and his companion, but in order to

[116] Castle, *Masquerade and Civilisation,* 45.
[117] Castle, *Masquerade and Civilisation,* 7.
[118] Castle, *Masquerade and Civilisation,* 350, 7n.
[119] Nicholas Rogers, *Crowd Culture and Politics in Georgian Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 18.

brutally assault an elderly woman demonstrated his own ability to ignore the justice system. The subversive nature of Burney's critique cannot therefore be overstated. It is Captain Mirvan who plays the Jacobite tyrant, who abuses the law for his own ends, using the threat of tyranny to bully Duval before cruelly masque-ing himself to dispense summary justice and reveals his own sovereignty in exercising the state of exception. [120]

Burney therefore compares Hanoverian national identity to Jacobite absolutism. The mask, Castle drew on Bakhtin to note, 'was the principle sign of self-alienation. In mask and costume one rejected conformity to oneself.'[121] In the often-ritualised unmasking that took place at the end of the evening 'ones' disguise, seen suddenly in relation to one's real identity, [excited] the onlooker by its absolute impropriety. The conceptual gap separating true and false selves was ideally an abyss.'[122] While he fails at unmasking her treason, Mirvan nevertheless succeeded in reducing her from a 'person of fashion' to barely a person. This is almost enough. 'Disguise' Castle asserts, 'when unveiled, is perceived as profoundly anti-social; witness the persistent association between the mask and criminality, travesty, and treachery.' [123] Yet the implicit gendered component here, not just of sexual assault but also of a wider attempt to ascertain her true sex – and whether her gendered transgressions are mirrored in bodily deviance – pointedly fail. Her pitiable state only intensifies her granddaughter's sympathies for her. The Captain's unmasking thus fails once again to consolidate a Hanoverian semiotics which links older forms of social order with Jacobite treason. There is yet another layer. Clothes, as Castle underscores, 'spoke symbolically of the human being beneath its folds. It reinscribed a person's […] rank.' More pertinently, it 'serves a signifying function within culture; it is, in fact, an institution inseparable from culture.[124] Burney thus presents us with a carnivalesque reversal of the carnivalesque, a ritualised inversion of inversion which destabilises the foundation not just of identity, but associates learning to become Hanoverian as a process of associating the Hanoverian regime with 'criminality, travesty, and treachery.'

[120] Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life,* trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 15.
[121] Burney, *Evelina*, 75.
[122] Castle, *Masquerade and Civilisation*, 75.
[123] Castle, *Masquerade and Civilisation*, 57.
[124] Castle, *Masquerade and Civilisation*, 56 – 7.

Captain Mirvan's disguise however, remains curiously impenetrable. Madame Duval only begins to realise the identity of her attacker when she 'heard that M. Du Bois had never left London during her absence,' the truth seeming to rush upon her at once 'Revenge was her first wish; and she vowed she would go the next morning to Justice Fielding, and inquire what punishment she might lawfully inflict upon the Captain for his assault. [125] It is only when Mr Branghton tells her that M. Du Bois could never have been in any danger that Duval suspects Mirvan. Indeed when 'the whole truth of the transaction seemed to rush upon her mind' it does so in only in the context of Mirvan's other assaults. In other words, Captain Mirvan's identity reveals itself through his actions, rather than his outward appearance. His disguise remains impeccable – indeed, he has depended on it. Madame Duval may have haltingly learned the language of politeness as a second language, but fluency is not a problem for Captain Mirvan, who is able to 'don and doff identities' at will.

Burney thereby evinces a complicated understanding of the brutal sectarianism of the law. Madame Duval's frequent refrain upon having been attacked by Captain Mirvan is that she will 'go to Justice Fielding.' She repeats this again after her assault, betraying a rather implausible trust in her ability to gain 'lawful' revenge against Mirvan. Yet as Terry Castle pointed out, Henry Fielding was inextricably bound up with the wider discourse of anti-popery, and held a particular hatred of Italian Operas, fantocinnis, and masquerades.[126] Fielding not only legislated, but published against what he saw as popish practices. Written contemporaneously to Hume and 'during his tenure as a magistrate on the Westminster bench' *The Charge Delivered to the Grand Jury* (1749) and *An Enquiry into The Causes of the Late Increase of Robbers* (1751),

> are part of that larger battle civil and religious authorities waged against the masquerade throughout the century. Fielding on occasion took an active role in the work of suppression; in June 1751 he was the magistrate who reprimanded a group of masqueraders apprehended when the high constable of Westminster staged a midnight raid on an illegal assembly near Exeter exchange. [127]

Duval 'receives very little encouragement' in her plans to go to the Justice.[128] But as Castle's evidence demonstrates, even had she gathered enough witnesses, she would have received no

[125] Burney, *Evelina,* 169.
[126] Castle, *Masquerade and Civilisation,* 10.
[127] Castle, *Masquerade and Civilisation,* 188.
[128] Burney, *Evelina,* 173.

justice from Fielding. Francophobic Britishness may be neither distinct from *ancien regime*, nor 'objectively constructed by the law' in Morieux's terms, but it may as well have been.[129] Whether it is Captain Mirvan or Sir John Belmont, male writing has immediate and reciprocal legal authority that is as absolute both and only as far as its author wishes. Women's writing and behaviour, by contrast is immediately suspect and potentially treasonous. Burney's comparison of Hanoverian authority with Stuart tyranny is not restricted to the act of Captain Mirvan's assault then; for all the awkward silence of his compatriots, Mirvan merely expresses the brutally contingent core of a wider state ideology.

Evelina's outrage at Duval's treatment drives her to test the limits of politeness. She begs Mrs Mirvan 'to lose no time in pleading the cause of Madame Duval' with the Captain.' She explains how she has 'already expostulated with him,' but that 'his favourite, Sir Clement,' contrives to urge him on. She takes the 'petitioner' to the Captain only to find language fails her:

> I was fearful of making him angry, and stammered very much, when I told him, I hoped he had no new plan for alarming Madame Duval.
> […]
> A sullen gloominess instantly clouded his face, and, turning short from me, he said, I might do as I pleased, but that I should much sooner repent than repair my officiousness.
> I was too much disconcerted at this rebuff to attempt making any answer [130]

If a cri du sang remakes Evelina's place, here the antithesis of such recognition breaks language, 'clouds' his face, and obscures the patriarchal sight on which her own recognition depends. Evelina attempts to convert a network of women in solidarity with the gendered and national violence enacted on her grandmother. She hopes that polite conversation will not just be 'mutually improving' between the sexes, but through solidarity engender a sense of collective agency. Burney is adamant that this is impossible. When Evelina suggests that Sir Clement would desist if she asked, Mrs Mirvan warns her that 'it is sometimes dangerous to make requests to men who are too desirous of receiving them.' Exploiting Sir Clement's interest for her own ends – even were they to be charitable - would be interpreted as dangerously unchaste. In other words, despite the promises of discursive control implicit in

[129] Renaud Morieux, *The Channel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 328-9.

[130] Burney, *Evelina,* 154-5.

Anglican women's supposedly moderating social influence via politeness, women cannot control the meaning of their words and 'requests.' She perseveres, yet finds her light hint elicits only 'sullen gloominess' and dark hints that she would 'repent' her interference. Evelina can only 'stutter' and withdraw. At best polite conversation can only enact change between women, clarifying the limits of their own agency. It grants Evelina no capital with Captain Mirvan or Sir Clement, and any attempt to use politeness against the status quo risks the breakdown of her own tenuous claims on nation and womanhood.

Worse, both Mrs Mirvan and Lady Howard are shown to be kept complicit. In order to 'go to Justice Fielding', Duval requires witnesses. Yet Mrs Mirvan, fearing the Captain's reaction, 'had been endeavouring to dissuade her […] having recourse to the law':

> She has, therefore, taken great pains to show the inutility of applying to justice, unless she were more able to describe the offenders against whom she would appear; and has assured her, that as she neither heard their voices, nor saw their faces, she cannot possibly swear to their persons, or obtain any redress.[131]

Lady Howard seems similarly predisposed to restrict Captain Mirvan's violence to one target. Like Evelina, she had suspected the original letter was 'some contrivance of the Captain [but] would not hazard the consequence of discovering his designs.'[132] Both Mrs Mirvan and Lady Howard therefore use their own mastery of polite language in order to rally other women together against Madame Duval, in the hope that they will not suffer the same violence. Their only hope is that the patriarchal gaze can be restricted to one target, while Anglican Womanhood can be constructed only through the social gaze of a group of women. This, of course, only demonstrates how the legal system is bound up with the wider theatrical system of visual surveillance: with no witnesses, 'Duval has little chance of establishing a case.'[133] While the complicity of the legal system has been well-established through both Sir John Belmont and Captain Mirvan's abuse, Burney rages here that Lady Howard and Mrs Mirvan's complicity in the status quo preclude the possibility of redress. Politeness both enshrines these women's Christian identities and ensures their subjugation. At best, it can react and dampen violence through deflection and minimisation. But it cannot refer with any

[131] Burney, *Evelina*, 156.
[132] Burney, *Evelina*, 143.
[133] Maunu, *Women Writing the Nation*, 77.

stability to a stable gendered or historic identity, and as such the troubling continuity between Protestant Britishness and the Catholic Stuart past remains unresolved.

Despite this scepticism however, *Evelina* has perhaps the most hopeful ending of all of Burney's published work. The child raised in Evelina's place is named co-heiress and, now that her true parentage is acknowledged, marries Evelina's half-brother. Evelina, recognised by Sir John Belmont, is able to marry, and swap her rightful name for that of Lord Orville. As Reverend Villars awaits them at Berry Hill, he ecstatically imagines their reunion 'the height of bliss' where 'the wounds […] of fortune':

> may be healed and purified by the ultimate consolation of pouring forth my dying words in blessings on my child!-closing these joy-streaming eyes in her presence, and breathing my last faint sighs in her loved arms!
> Grieve not, oh child of my care! Grieve not at the inevitable moment! but may thy own end be equally propitious! Oh, may'st thou, when full of days, and full of honour, sink down as gently to rest!-be loved as kindly, watched as tenderly, as thy happy father! And mayest thou, when thy glass is run, be sweetly, but not bitterly, mourned by some remaining darling of thy affections-some yet surviving Evelina! [134]

Evelina appears to have successfully inherited elite Anglican womanhood while radically affirming the possibility of a reformed society which accepts the validity of two national inheritances. Both chastity and loyalty remain intact. Villars' early 'trembl[ing] for [her] future tranquillity' and hope in the 'unsullied whiteness of [her] soul' is repeated and completed in this final letter.[135] Despite Sir John Belmont's critical role in her legitimacy, Villars imagines himself as 'thy happy father' and Evelina as not just 'my child' but a 'child of my care' who will one day be 'mourned by some remaining darling of thy affections.' Reverend Villars thereby congratulates himself on successfully replicating a new Hanoverian family founded on emotive kinship.

Evelina's final reply however points to a different preference.

> ALL is over, my dearest Sir; and the fate of your Evelina is decided! This morning, with fearful joy and trembling gratitude, she united herself for ever with the object of her dearest, her eternal affection.

[134] Burney, *Evelina*, 405.
[135] Burney, *Evelina*, 57.

> I have time for no more; the chaise now waits which is to conduct me to dear Berry Hill, and to the arms of the best of men.[136]

Evelina replies to the language of familial devotion and fatherly duty with comparative distance and respect. Villars is not her father but 'my dearest Sir,' or 'the best of men,' a response which acknowledges his deathbed fantasies of expiring in her arms without confirming them. As Karen Lipsedge argues, by the end of the novel she successfully acquires what Doody calls 'a social mask', a transformation reflected in her locative shift from the margins to the centre of the novels' rooms.[137] She has, in other words, learned the importance of assuming the 'mask' or masque of Anglican Womanhood – of being seen to acquiesce to Hanoverian authority in the person of her guardian and under threat of violence. Julie Parks argues that the 'marriages that end *Evelina, Cecilia,* and *Camilla* can only provide weak and ambiguous closure.'[138] Yet this misses the fact that it is not marriage, but parentage, family, and nationhood that are contested on a vastly unequal battlefield. Once this is taken into account, Evelina's quiet affirmation of Belmont's legitimacy sweetens the novel's comprehension of the failure of politeness as any sort of social glue into a general ambiguity. In the seamless integration of both Evelina and her Catholic-educated 'sister' into society and under the banner of both Sir John Belmont and Reverend Villars however, Frances Burney affirms – however tenuously – the enduring problem of both Hanoverian present and Stuart past, of a Protestant and a Catholic Britishness. But the awkward accession of Evelina leaves behind the Catholic educated 'sister' and half-brother in a mirror-dynasty, whose eventual loss of legitimacy remains as contingent as Evelina's success.

Evelina must therefore be read as an optimistic assessment of negotiation with a resurgent Hanoverian patriarchal authority attempting to naturalise gendered, national ideals via a polite marketplace. Contrary to previous readings, Madame Duval's representation is neither ambiguous nor derogatory. Readings which identify her with Burney's stepmother miss the extent to which other characters understand her as implicated in the material economy of Jacobitism and alternate English histories. Indeed, the problem haunting *Evelina* is one of unstable social capital and equality at the cost of sublimation. If the sociable marketplace which underpins British liberty offers identity through dressing and purchasing the correct

[136] Burney, *Evelina,* 406.
[137] Karen Lipsedge, *Domestic Space in Eighteenth-Century British Novels* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012), 79.
[138] Park, *Novel Relations,* 132.

objects, it also suggests the possibility of representing alternate identities through composite purchases. This is Captain Mirvan's terror – that non-Hanoverian histories can be supported and loyalties hinted at by involvement in other material cultures. This chapter thus shows the poverty of readings which do not consider questions of religion and nationality. It also demonstrates how these concerns were at the forefront of Burney's world view from her earliest published writings, and inextricable from her own attempts to work out her place in the world. In a wider sense, this chapter's recovery of the embedded and embodied nature of questions of nation, gender, and religion underscore how foundational Burney scholarship repeats the trope of separate spheres. That is, it assumed Burney's reading and awareness of broader political debates only interested her insofar as it provided material for questions of domestic agency. Yet while *Evelina*'s epistolary negotiation points to Vickery inter alia's identification of print culture as a new sphere for engagement, Burney remains profoundly ambiguous about the possibility of politeness as a social key for women. It is in *Cecilia*, however, that the failures and indeed dangers of politeness for Anglican woman become the most apparent.

Chapter two: "Ay, Ay! Don Duke, poke in the old charnel houses by yourself, none of your defunct for me!'" Blood, Debt, and the Failures of the Sociable Marketplace in Frances Burney's *Cecilia* (1782)

Frances Burney's second novel *Cecilia* (1782) continues *Evelina's* interrogation of the ability of polite womanhood to bridge religious difference. Unlike *Evelina*, however, Cecilia is much more explicit in condemnation of socio-economic credit, politeness, and Anglican identity. The novel begins with the orphaned Cecilia Beverley on the cusp of adulthood, summoned from the countryside to London by her three guardians, the aristocratic Mr Delvile, the austere Mr Briggs, and the sociable Mr Harrel. In a few short weeks, she stands to inherit £10,000 from her late parents, along with an income of £3,000 a year from her late uncle. The only impediment to the latter is that any future husband should take the name of Beverley, rather than vice versa. She soon falls in love. Unfortunately for her, Mr Delvile refuses to permit her to marry his son Mortimer, Mr Briggs hampers Cecilia's charitable life by refusing to permit any spending, and Mr Harrel's frivolous sociability is increasingly funded by loans wheedled from Cecilia's capital. This is not a comic novel of encounter with economic archetypes. Cecilia's attempts to persuade Mr and Mrs Delvile to exchange their name for her capital and sociability reflects an Anglican offer of sociability to impoverished Catholics with nothing left but their history. Mr Briggs' radical austerity, and his constant teasing both of Mr Harrel's excess and Mr Delvile's apparent ancestor worship represent a Puritan rejection of consumption and Catholicism that offers nothing but isolation and misery. Cecilia is unable to deny her capital to Mr Harrel's whose social and economic credit are always on the brink of a ruin that will eventually lead him to suicide.

Cecilia therefore depicts an unsettled proto-bourgeois society. Economic and social credit is conflated. The promise of social mobility is countered with the violent spectre of bankruptcy and death. Doody rightly argues *Cecilia* is a novel influenced by the shadow of the Gordon Riots and the spectre of the French Revolution.[1] Social upheaval is everywhere: her guardians refuse to remain in their allotted roles, the spectre of debt, credit, and the resulting social and economic bankruptcy haunts the novel. Julia Epstein continues this, arguing that

[1] Margaret Anne Doody, *Fanny Burney: The Life in the Works* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1988), 100, 112.

Cecilia reflects Burney's stark world view: 'young women live inside an envelope of continual material threat to their individual selfhood and to their social and economic survival.'[2] Cecilia is 'triply orphaned', bound to a surname that has no real meaning for her yet which determines her fate, and is caught in a web of interdependent but contradictory dependencies. [3] Similarly, Miranda Burgess sees *Cecilia* as the first of Burney's trilogy of 'economic romances' in which 'romances of sentiment' instead teach the heroines 'the advantages of tradition.'[4] This reflects a wider similar critical strand that sees *Cecilia* as an interrogation of competing modes of kinship and society in the late eighteenth century, between aristocrat and bourgeois, between sanguineal and affinal. [5] It is this maelstrom of unfixed, indeed illegible social relations which Burney and her heroines find psychologically unbearable, and which these critics argue her plots struggle to resolve.

Yet such readings miss the religious associations of Cecilia's guardians, and her own initial declaration that she will live in society by polite Anglican principles. Questions of economic and social order in the eighteenth century were simultaneously discussions of religious difference, with the merits of socio-economic austerity and luxury reflecting Calvinistic and Gallican forms of order. More broadly, the chapter suggests that, pace my earlier work on politeness, just as Cecilia represents an attempt to embody gendered ideals of Anglican moderation, so too does the Delvile family represent recusant attempts to exist in the sociable marketplace without fully playing into bourgeois ideals of value. In *Cecilia*, to a degree not explicit till *Camilla*, Burney identifies the system of polite capital which underpins Anglican hegemony and belies its claims to reasonable moderation. As I have previously argued, Cecilia attempts to use conduct-book politeness and Anglican moderation to leverage her

---

[2] Julia Epstein, *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing* (Madison, WI: The University of Madison Press, 1989), 155.
[3] Epstein, *Iron Pen*, 156.
[4] Miranda Burgess, 'Courting Ruin: The Economic Romances of Frances Burney', *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (Winter, 1995), 131-15, 131-2.
[5] Ruth Perry, *Novel Relations: The Transformation of Kinship in English Literature and Culture, 1748 – 1818* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 3;
Brian McCrea, *Frances Burney and Narrative Prior to Ideology* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013), 59;
Barbara Zonitch *Familiar Violence: Gender and Social Upheaval in the Novels of Frances Burney* (London: University of Delaware Press, 1997), 18, 61-2, 71.
See also Melissa J Ganz' argument for the novel's engagement with the Marriage Act of 1753. Melissa J. Ganz, 'Clandestine Schemes: Burney's "*Cecilia*" and the Marriage Act', *The Eighteenth Century*, Vol. 54, No. 1 (SPRING 2013), 25-51

social position and negotiate a marriage with Mortimer Delvile. Yet as Mrs Delvile understands, Cecilia's politeness is merely the velvet glove over the patriarchal economic capital she represents. If the marriage were to go ahead, the abolition of their family name would see the annihilation of their Catholic past under Hanoverian society. Their crumbling castle, dusty relics, and untended grounds would be renovated into fashionable spaces – but spaces which no longer proved Catholic claims to English history, and which bear troubling witness to the violence of Anglican Hegemony. It is Cecilia's confrontation with this material past, a difference which polite sociability demands she not acknowledge, which silences her as effectively as Captain Mirvan's clouded and gloomy expression silences Evelina.

Cecilia's dreams of using her wealth to sustain both a life of charity and her position as an elite woman through moral control of the lower orders mirror almost exactly the promises held in courtesy literature for elite Anglican women. Burney therefore understands these choices to be empty. Mr Harrel, whose fashionable social life is founded entirely on debt, easily uses the threat of violence to extract her capital, sustaining his social position until he bankruptcy forces him to suicide. The charitable spending and polite sociability of Anglican women then creates no moderating influence on society. Violence is epidemic, economic and social credit precarious, the law brutal and illegible for those under it. If Mr Harrel represents the precarity of fashionable sociability through cycles of bankruptcy, debt, and death, then the bankruptcy his default brings on tradespeople and the existential terror and disruption his creditors' appearance heralds in polite spaces point to the incoherence of Hanoverian social order.

Mr Harrel's understanding of the interdependence of social and economic credit to identity points to a deeper and more troubling link between Hanoverian supremacy and its reliance on the marketplace. The tacit reduction of British national identity to a series of choices, to participate or not, to purchase or not, to behave in this way or that in certain spaces, links consumption to loyalty. Participation in consumer society is a natural state of being for English Protestants. A refusal to participate signals an almost unthinkable inhumanity. The Delviles dusty and aloof poverty then, their refusal to accept her money in exchange for relinquishing their name only further proves the intrinsic foreignness of Catholicism. Yet for them, their gothic ruined castle, their unkempt and unfashionable lawn, represent the lost histories of Catholic English identity. To lose their name is as unthinkable for them as Mortimer's cousin's suggestion of exchanging their house for a more fashionable London

residence. In so doing, they might be permitted to perform 'patrician duties of sociability and hospitality', but this would require acquiescence into the Hanoverian view of history.[6] It is no wonder then that Cecilia's attempts to persuade Mrs Delvile to agree to the marriage on Cecilia's terms along with Mortimer's refusal to give up Cecilia in terms which explicitly mirror the oath of allegiance lead to blood letting which rivals that of Mr Harrel's suicide. Mrs Delvile's near-fatal aneurysm points to the violence underpinning the encounter, and in its invocation of the sectarian bloodshed of the Reformation, underscores Burney's final argument that Anglican and Catholic identities can only safely interweave when on an equal footing.

This chapter first places *Cecilia* briefly in the context of *Evelina's* success and Frances' fame alongside that of her father. Despite being newly concerned with the role of money however, like its predecessor *Cecilia's* obsession with inheritance, credit, family, guardianship, and legitimacy serve as microcosms of these same concerns on the national stage. Pointing to the religious stereotypes at play in her guardians and Cecilia's explicitly Anglican attitude to her wealth and behaviour at play in the opening pages, the chapter then argues that this sees Burney representing a modern, Anglican woman attempting to integrate into an old, Catholic family. Polite language, as Cecilia soon discovers, is not enough. Nor, in contrast to *Evelina*, can it protect the Catholic Mrs Delvile from the shadow of religious conflict. Polite, Anglican identity, Burney ultimately argues, cannot serve as a novel meeting ground because that identity is merely another means by which Hanoverian claims to sovereignty are asserted. It is only, therefore, when Cecilia is stripped of the wealth and status that granted her access to polite status and elite identity in the first place that the Anglican Cecilia and Catholic Mortimer can come together without the threat of destruction.

The success of *Evelina* and Frances' introduction into her father's social circle brought new anxieties on top of family stresses.[7] Though Frances was overjoyed at introduction to, and

[6] Gabriel Glickman, *The English Catholic Community, 1688 – 1745: Politics, Culture, and Ideology* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), 63.

[7] Elizabeth Allen Burney had decided to send Maria Allen – her eldest daughter – to school at Geneva in 1771 to separate her from her lover Martin Rishton. But they, like Bessie and Samuel, would elope at Ypres. Sarah Harriet was sent first at some point in 1780, followed by Richard the following autumn, with the Meekes leaving Geneva in 'late 1782' for Paris.
Frances Burney to Hester Lynch Thrale, 26th November 1780. Betty Rizzo, ed. *The Early Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney*, Vol 4: The Streatham Years, Part II, 1780 – 1781, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003, 2014 [online]),250-4, n.55;

adulation from her father's friends Thrale, Johnson, and Burke, the thought of her body of writing on the marketplace, that 'every Butcher & Baker, Cobbler & Tinker, throughout the three kingdoms [might read her work] for the small tribute of 3 pence' at the circulating libraries was horrifying.[8] The writing which permitted her to write back and interrogate the demands of the sociable marketplace on her body now pushed her ever more inexorably into that space. The promise of, if not control, then negotiation, only served up ever more scrupulous surveillance. Worse, her family and new friends were encouraging her to continue writing.[9] She was now 26. With no obvious suitor, writing for the stage – despite the moral dangers - seemed to offer the best chance of economic self-sufficiency.[10] The result was *The Witlings*, a satire on the bluestocking circle around Elizabeth Montagu. The first private reading to friends and family was a success. Yet Samuel Crisp and Dr Burney's doubts soon began to grow. Montagu was one of Charles' patrons. One word from her or her friends and the family could be cast into penury. Crisp and Burney quietly agreed novel writing would be a more suitable occupation.[11] Her father and brothers now took full control of negotiations. The second volume of Charles' history of music was soon due, and Charles appears to have conducted his daughters' business with thoughts of how the no-longer-anonymous second novel might bolster his own sales.[12] Though Doody is careful to underscore that *Cecilia* (1782) was a 'wanted' novel by Frances, it is still one that is even more inextricable from the Burney family's influence and identity.[13]

Cecilia begins with both an explicit acknowledgement of Stuart legitimacy and of its loss. Cecilia Beverley has suffered 'a triple orphaning', the deaths of her parents and uncle are followed in quick succession by her three guardians, Mr Harrel, Mr Delvile, and Mr Briggs decision to uproot her from her "material counsellor" Mrs Charlton, and summon her from

Simon Macdonald, 'Identifying Mrs Meeke: Another Burney Family Novelist' *The Review of English Studies*, 64 (2013), 367 – 385, 377 – 8.

[8] Claire Harman, *Fanny Burney: A Biography* (London: Flamingo, 2001), 98, 118 - 9.

[9] Epstein, *The Iron Pen*, 24-5.

[10] Margaret Anne Doody, *Fanny Burney: The Life in the Works* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1988), 71.

[11] The 'Blue Stockings Society.' Originally, an informal coterie of women surrounding Elizabeth Montagu, with a mixed focus on mutual improvement and literary discussion, with a cloud of surrounding men including Burke, Johnson, and Garrick. The literature is voluminous. A good starting point is: Elizabeth Eger, *Bluestockings: Women of Reason from Enlightenment to Romanticism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

[12] Doody, 99.

[13] Doody, 100

Bury St Edmonds to London.[14] The very first words of the novel are a 'secret prayer' at the final sight of 'the abode of her youth' from the as-yet-unnamed heroine:

> Peace to the spirits of my honoured parents, respected be their remains, and immortalised their virtues! May time, while it moulders their frail relics to the dust, commit to tradition the record of their goodness, and Oh may their orphan-descendent be influenced through life by the remembrance of their purity, and be solaced in death, that by her it was unsullied!'[15]

Beginning with a prayer for the dead and reverence for their relics, Cecilia's first words carry a distinctly ecumenical character. As she had been informed in childhood, prayers for the dead would not sit easily with all their fellow Anglicans.[16] Cecilia here has no doubts about the legitimacy of her parents' authority, nor through them a social order founded on 'relics,' inheritance, and 'tradition'. Yet that social order is broken. She is 'depriv[ed] of her last relation'. If the social order in *Evelina* depends on a precarious epistolary exchange underwritten and undermined by constant violence, then it is one that is dependent on arguing that competing modes of authority have abdicated their responsibility while still haunting the margins. Cecilia denies the possibility of such an abdication. Instead, her difficulties lie less with negotiation than interpretation; of trying to find a way to continue rather than replace. Unsurprisingly, the driving force of *Cecilia* are not letters – living documents – but a will. This post-mortem attempt at authority, indeed, attempts to continue a name and family by using the female line to graft itself onto a new dynasty.

Cecilia's hinting at the dynastic gymnastics required to find continuance between James II and his daughter to the eventual Hanoverian dynasty appears dangerously explicit. This could be explained by the novel's contemporary setting. *Evelina* avoids direct mention of a date, though Captain Mirvan alludes to his service in the Seven Years War (1756-63), but *Cecilia*'s context is better attested – a letter refers directly to June 1779.[17] The distinction is not trivial. The Old Pretender James III had died in 1766. But Clement XIII, having encouraged his cardinals to welcome George III's brother, the Duke of York, refused to recognise Charles

[14] Julia Epstein, *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing* (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1989), 156.
[15] Frances Burney, *Cecilia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 5.
[16] Claire Harman, *Fanny Burney: A Biography* (London: Flamingo, 2000), 10.
[17] Burney, *Cecilia, 389.*

Edward Stuart as Charles III.[18] If Evelina was a product of the mid-century milieu, fresh in the memory of the old cause, then *Cecilia* depicts a country where the Jacobite cause has not just failed, but been extinguished. With no pretender to the throne, and no chance of invasion, the literary anxiety could be replaced with more abstract if acute discussions of sovereignty and inheritance.

Cut off from the old certainties, Burney sees only a chaotic jumble of authority. As Doody points out, her three guardians are unable to keep to their own domains:

> Controlled still by another's will (literally) she must accept her uncle the Dean's three guardians: Mr. Delvile, a man of high birth (to see to respectability); Mr. Briggs. A City man (to look after the money); and Mr. Harrel, husband of her old school-friend (to offer company and friendship). The guardians refuse to remain in their allotted places; the guardian of birth can affect her friendship and affections, and the guardian for friendship's sake has a disastrous effect on her money.[19]

Each detests the other. Briggs thinks Harrel a spendthrift and Delvile a haughty bankrupt, Delvile that Briggs and Harrel are barely 'rising from dust and obscurity,'[20] while Harrel – chosen only due to his wife – is consumed by the fashionable life and barely pays any attention to the other two. They are, as Straub points out, 'virtual parodies of the patriarchal social authority which theoretically should protect her.'[21] As Julian Fung has pointed out, with the exception of Mr Briggs and addition of her old friend Mr Monckton, they 'managed to cause the heroine more financial and psychological harm than anyone in *Evelina.*[22]

The guardians' struggle for Cecilia's loyalty, however, also represents distinct historical and religious arguments. As Helen Barry argues, polite behaviour was intrinsically economic as much as linguistic. The King attempted to show his own politeness by moderation in spending.[23] But there were limits: 'austere behaviour was considered by the Georgians to be a masculine characteristic indicative of religious and philosophical views that were at odds

[18] Nigel Aston, *Christianity and Revolutionary Europe, c. 1750 – 1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 29.
[19] Margaret Anne Doody, *Frances Burney,* 113-4.
[20] Burney, *Cecilia,* 187.
[21] Kristina Straub, *Divided Fictions: Fanny Burney and Feminine Strategy* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1989), 113.
[22] Julian Fung, 'Frances Burney as Satirist', *The Modern Language Review,* Vol. 106, No. 4 (October 2011), 937 – 953, 944.
[23] Helen Barry, 'The Pleasures of Austerity' *JECS, Vol.*37, No.2 (2014), 261 – 277, 262

with socially approved standards of polite behaviour.'[24] In other words, 'the suspicious pleasures of self-denial […] raised the twin spectres of papist infiltration from abroad and schism and fanaticism at home in the minds of many moderate Anglicans.'[25] Mr Briggs and Mr Delvile are therefore two sides of the same coin: if Briggs represents an austerity rooted in puritan self-abnegation, Delvile represents the 'capuchin Catholic renunciation'. Cecilia's guardians, then, are not just comic archetypes, but a way into a deeper political and historical critique of Anglican claims to sovereignty.

Cecilia's guardians therefore represent the possibilities and histories not just for young women, but for the precarious British state. In *Of The Protestant Succession* David Hume argues that without the security of primogeniture, a prince would rely on faction to maintain power, and with no linearity whatsoever, 'would not every popular leader put in his claim at every vacancy, or even without any vacancy?'[26] *Cecilia*, therefore, does not just depict three guardians struggling between themselves for the legal and moral authority over a young woman. It also represents a post-Jacobite, abruptly multi-polar England that lacks a defined enemy from abroad against which to unify. Robbed of the Francophobic possibilities seized upon by Captain Mirvan, the introspective state requires internal enemies and possibilities against which it can prove its moderation. Robbed too of the certainties of order, Burney describes a Humean maelstrom of 'faction' as each guardian attempts to impose his own exclusive authority over Cecilia and England.

Mr Harrel represents the bankruptcy of the Hanoverian state. Cecilia had been looking forward to meeting Mr Harrel and his wife, an old friend from childhood. Yet, their 'gay, fashionable, and splendid figure' life soon alienates their charge, who 'finds that they are leading a life of shocking dissipation.'[27] Resolving to focus on her own charitable giving, Cecilia climbs into a carriage to visit town when she is confronted by a half-starved woman with a dress 'too neat for a beggar.' A shocked Cecilia offers first a crown, then a guinea, only to be astounded when the woman offers her a receipt for work done on a building 'for the purpose of performing plays in private.'[28] Pressed further, she explains her husband was

[24] Ibid.
[25] Barry, 268.
[26] David Hume, 'Of The Protestant Succession,' *Political Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 213-5.
[27] Edward Copeland, 'Money in the Novels of Fanny Burney,' *Studies in the Novel* Vol. 8, No. 1 (Spring 1976), 24-37, 29.
[28] Burney, *Cecilia,* 71.

disabled while working on the theatre, and that the Harrel's refusal to pay their £20 has brought the family to the point of starvation. Cecilia promises to plead her case, only for Mr Harrel to claim first he has lost the bill and then to chide her credulity:

> 'o,' cried Mr. Harrel, laughing, 'what a dismal tale has she been telling you! No doubt she saw you were fresh from the country! But if you give credit to all the faragoes of these trumpery imposters, you will never have a moment to yourself, nor a guinea in your purse'[29]

This is an extraordinary and damning statement of Anglican Britishness' entangling of social and economic credit. That Mr Hill was working on a private theatre reveals how the fashionable social order expounded in Evelina's succession of plays, ridottos, and operas and its associated economy of milliners, hairdressers, and jewellers, does not – contra Smith and Hume – create a web of interdependence. Just as marriage certificates can be discarded and legal documents faked in *Evelina* so too can bills and contracts be discarded in *Cecilia.* Like Captain Mirvan's outbursts, Mr Harrel here serves to instruct Cecilia in polite sociability. But Catherine Keohane pointed out, Cecilia's status as 'fresh from the country' is inextricable from her discovery in Mrs Hill of 'the unexpected instability of the positions of debtor and creditor, giver and receiver.'[30] Refusing to extend 'credit to all the faragoes of these trumpery imposters', is critical to keeping the 'guinea in your purse'. But not only is Mr Harrel able to take that guinea from Cecilia's purse with ease, but his warning that workmen and merchants are nothing but 'trumpery imposters' reflects an ironic dismissal from Burney of polite identity.

The Harrel's masquerade further illuminates the 'trumpery' of this Hanoverian identity. Masquerades have been well examined by Terry Castle, who draws on Bakhtin to argue for the structural function of the masquerade and carnivalesque in eighteenth-century literature. Masking and epistemological rituals were inextricable from hegemonic discourses of Anglican vs Catholic identities. This was shown in Chapter One. It suffices to note both the economic and political aspects at play here. As Julia Epstein explained, in 'one of the most extraordinary passages in Burney's fiction […] the baroque carnival permeat[es] this narrative' as much as money 'overs over everything':

---

[29] Burney, *Cecilia,* 74.
[30] Catherine Keohane, '"Too Neat for a Beggar": Charity and Debt in Burney's Cecilia' *Studies in the Novel,* Vol. 33, No. 4 (Winter 2001), 379-401, 380.

> All the characters appear in disguise in this sequence, and the barriers between characters and their identities, and between social class and acceptable behaviours, are radically broken by the chaotic presence of "masks." […] Events at the masquerade demonstrate an observation made by symbolic anthropologists, that body images, clothing, and rules about control of bodies and their presentation reflect the distribution of power in a given culture. Cecilia, indeed, becomes the heroine stripped bare as she decides to attend in ordinary dress.[31]

She finds herself surrounded and lost, unable to understand the 'plenitude of unreadable signs [which] tak[e] over in the masquerade.'[32] 'Dominos of no character, and fancy-dresses of no meaning' mix with 'Spaniards, chimney-sweepers, Turks, Watchmen, conjurers and old women,' who speak in 'the local cant of, 'Do you know me? Who are you? And I know you' with the sly pointing of the finger […] and the pert squeak of the voice.'[33] Mr Harrel, as Cecilia remarked earlier with customary disgust, seemed to consider his house 'merely as an hotel.'[34] A transient space, in other words, to which he is tied only through a bill he may or may not pay. Whereas in *Evelina* it was first Madame Duval and then Captain Mirvan that seemed inextricable from the world of signs and portents of Jacobitism, Burney here suggests Hanoverian identity is nothing more than a succession of costumes in an indebted space, where 'local cant' is the order of the day now that signifier and signified have been severed along with the link between debtor and creditor, aristocrat and peasant.[35] Hanoverian England's reliance on this sociable marketplace to establish itself in the country therefore threatens to create an incestuous and fractured society, one in which not just is there no interdependence between classes but even among the ton. It is no coincidence that Mrs Harrel is the first victim, 'emotionally and intellectually dead' even before Cecilia meets her.[36]

This 'trumpery' is dangerous not just because of its ruinous effect on social relations, but also because its inevitable collapse engenders terrifying violence. Mr Harrel cannot outrun his

---

[31] Epstein, *The Iron Pen,* 161-2.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Burney, *Cecilia,* 106-7.
[34] Burney, *Cecilia,* 53.
[35] The ease with which the characters assume and discard racial and class identities has obvious links to Frances' own experiences with Omai, the Tahitian for whom James Burney translated. Burney's cousin later used Omai's dress as the formation of a masquerade identity. See: Dror Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004), 123-6; Charlotte Ann to Frances Burney, Monday morning April 11th 1774-6?, Barrett Collection Vol IV, Egerton MS 3693, British Library.

[36] Ibid.

debts forever. Returning one day to Portland Square, Cecilia finds 'a look of consternation among the servants, and an appearance of confusion in the whole house.'[37] On her way to her room, she passes Mr Harrel 'with an air so wild and perturbed, that he hardly seemed to know her.' The 'local cant' of the masquerade again marks the instability of social identity. In the library, he complains that 'I am ruined! – I am undone! – I am blasted forever!' and when Cecilia probes further, he explains that 'my debts!' and 'my creditors!' have left 'one way only':

> "What will you undertake?" cried he, eagerly, "I know you are an angel! — tell me, what will you undertake?"
> "I will — " said Cecilia, hesitating, "I will speak to Mr Monckton, — I will consult —"
> "You may as well consult with every cursed creditor in the house!" interrupted he; "but do so, if you please; my disgrace must perforce reach him soon, and a short anticipation is not worth begging off."
> "Are your creditors then actually in the house?"
> "O yes, yes! and therefore it is high time I should be out of it! — Did you not see them? — Do they not line the hall? — They threaten me with three executions before night! — three executions unless I satisfy their immediate demands! —"[38]

Mr Harrel has already extracted the majority of Cecilia's unencumbered wealth, first through promises of repayment, then appealing to Mrs Harrel's tears, and now – as he runs to snatch a razor - through threats of suicide. As Kristina Straub identified, the 'the fashionable life that living with the Harrels offers Cecilia is not merely boring; it is dangerous in both psychic and material terms. Harrel ruins both himself and his wife.'[39] Burney in fact goes further. Such lives as the Harrels – and thus arguably all polite lives – are illegitimate because they ignore their social obligations and realities of their purchases. It is for this reason that the presence of creditors inside the polite space of Harrel's house is not just impolite, but a harbinger of the return of civil unrest and 'execution.' Hanoverian rule, based on consumption, freedom, and unrestrained sociability is thus intrinsically fragile. The existence of credit points to the continuance of a healthy society, where trust between merchant and aristocrat reflects the post-revolutionary compact. Yet the inability to pay those spiralling debts, as worth and consumption become ever more intertwined, risks not even a return to now lost Stuart past, but a revolutionary and nihilistic anarchy, where one's debtors seek to reclaim the property – and country – on which one has defaulted.

---

[37] Burney, *Cecilia,* 263
[38] Burney, *Cecilia,* 266.
[39] Straub, *Divided Fictions,* 121.

It is appropriate that it is in the pleasure gardens of Vauxhall where Mr Harrel eventually follows through on his threat. Getting rid of the creditors and Mr Harrel's threats of suicide requires Cecilia to part with £7,500, and soon after she parts with a total of £8050. Another crisis appears, though this time Cecilia is ready to refuse even the pleadings of Harrel's brother in law. Mrs Harrel's tears, however, do move her, and 'Harrel makes a bargain' – he will escape to the continent and leave Mrs Harrel in England with Cecilia on the condition she surrenders one thousand pounds.[40] Cecilia acquiesces, and Mr Harrel makes his preparations. But what was supposed to be a feint to Vauxhall turns into:

> A miscellaneous and ill-matched party, […] The weird festivity is a fascinating and irritating superimposition upon real anxiety; the two women worry that Harrel may become too drunk to make his escape to the Channel, and keep hoping that he will make his departure. […] The Vauxhall episode winds up the tension until the string breaks: 'Scarcely had Mr Harrel quitted the box and their sight, before their ears were suddenly struck with the report of a pistol' (III:413)[41]

As Evelina discovered, pleasure gardens were dangerous spaces where prostitutes mingled with morally spotless ladies. The trick, inevitably, was learning to discern the impolite from the polite.[42] Careful watching, of finding social order in that maelstrom, proved one's politeness through discerning who was impolite and did not belong to the new social order. Vauxhall is perhaps the most open and thus dangerous of these social spaces, where 'a play of glances and stares […] composed the visual "space" of these social arenas.'[43] Yet even by 1778, when *Evelina* was published, Vauxhall had declined in popularity compared to Ranelagh, which had been set up as an elite alternative.[44] These spaces, along with Mr Harrel's ever-changing, hotel-like, house, are united in their fragile reliance on consumption, fashion, and constructive social vision. They are therefore reflective of Anglican 'mixed' spaces, akin to the theatre in *Evelina,* where mature British identities can be contested and

[40] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 132.
[41] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 133.
[42] Evelina does not enjoy her time at Vauxhall, 'very pretty, but too formal' (194), though the greatest danger comes from losing her party and stumbling across a troop of 'very riotous' (197) men who trap, then grope, her and the Branghton girls. At Marylebone, meanwhile, a trip to see the fireworks ends with Evelina again becoming separated from her party and being mistaken for first by a young officer and then by several prostitutes, for a prostitute (234-5). Frances Burney, *Evelina,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
[43] Steven J. Gores, *Psychosocial Spaces: Verbal and Visual Readings of British Culture, 1750 – 1820* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2000), 53.
[44] Janine Barchas, *Matters of Fact in Jane Austen: History, Location, and Celebrity* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012), 138.

tempered through exposure to extremes. They are also unstable spaces, the politeness of which is constantly at risk because they become polite only by welcoming the impolite, who constantly threaten to reveal the fragility of politeness' hegemonic claims. Mr Harrel's gathering of such a 'miscellaneous and ill-matched' company in a space whose function is to sort and exclude company therefore extends the incursion of his creditors into his house. Suicide, loss of credit and 'going abroad' are all therefore inextricably bound up in departure from British national identity. When credit dries up, as his suicide note remarks, debts can only be paid 'with a bullet.' The claims of Hanover are, Burney therefore argues, frighteningly tenuous, reliant on refined, bodies naturalised through an ever-changing material culture where bankruptcy is inextricable from death. Yet as Cecilia herself comes to demonstrate, with Hanoverian legitimacy reduced to polite bodies and spaces, the performance of Anglican womanhood becomes all that seems to stand between stable society and a return to sectarian bloodshed.

At the masquerade, Cecilia met Mortimer, the only son of Mr Delvile. They soon fell in love. But her delight at Mortimer's reciprocation turns to disgust when he suggests elopement, explaining that his father would never accept the name clause on which her wealth depends. As Mr Briggs explained when Cecilia first decided to live with Mr Delvile,

> Mr Delvile married his cousin, and each of them instigates the other to believe that all birth and rank would be at an end in the world, if their own superb family had not a promise of support from their hopeful Mortimer. [45]

Mrs Delvile later explains that her husband had thought of uniting Mortimer with his cousin Lady Honoria, but Mortimer 'never could endure the proposal.'[46] Still, the family hold out hope that Mortimer will consent to marry Honoria's younger sister Lady Euphrasia, who boasts a better fortune and education. Little surprise, then, that some of the most persuasive readings of *Cecilia* have focussed on shifting patterns in marriage and kinship. Barbara Zonitch argues that Burney's novels are obsessed by how the decline of patriarchal, aristocratic society grants women a degree of agency, at the cost of exposing them to the violence of the marketplace.[47] To her, the Delviles' ruined castle and gloomy townhouse

[45] Burney, *Cecilia*, 166.
[46] Burney, *Cecilia*, 500-501
[47] Barbara Zonitch, *Familiar Violence: Gender and Social Upheaval in the Novels of Frances Burney* (London: University of Delaware Press, 1997), 93.

represent their comparative debility to the spendthrift Mr Harrel and parsimonious Mr Briggs, each wrapped up in the new bourgeois system of credit.[48] Ruth Perry goes further, suggesting that the Delvile's fixation on first-cousin marriages indicated how they clung to an outdated sanguineal kinship pattern. Mid to late eighteenth-century novels such as *Cecilia* responded to a significant shift from kinship based on blood lineage to 'an axis based on conjugal and affinal ties of the married couple.'[49] Melissa J Ganz, meanwhile, argues that *Cecilia* critiques Hardwicke's marriage act of 1753, which aimed to prevent clandestine marriages such as those proposed by Mortimer.[50]

What is often overlooked is how Cecilia's attitude to her wealth is grounded in a sense of duty as much Christian as it is a rejection of the Harrel's 'fashionable life of dissipation.'[51] She looks forward with 'trembling' to the duties required of her by her 'splendid income' and independence, something she 'fervently' conceptualises as a 'debt contracted with the poor' which must be repaid 'with interest.'[52] Cecilia conceptualises her own identity in terms of a legal, hierarchical, and moral web. Her own agency depends on her legal subordination to the will of her clergyman uncle; but is in turn dependent on her own moral 'duty' to 'act right' and engage in Christian charity. Cecilia's weltanschauung echoes conduct literature, eighteenth-century texts which in Joyce Hemlow's words 'attempted to resolve uncertainties about the position of women' in a society where class boundaries had suddenly become quasi-permeable.[53] As J Paul Hunter identified, the post-Richardsonian novel's fixation with a legible system of manners reflected the loss of a great chain of being in the English Civil Wars of 1642-51 and the Glorious Revolution of 1688-9.[54]

Although the exact function of courtesy books has long been debated, they nevertheless expressed certain baseline ideals for gendered behaviour in the late eighteenth century. As Claudia Marina Vessilli sums up, they recommend modesty, prudence, and decorum under an

[48] Zonitch, *Familiar Violence*, 18, 55.
[49] Ruth Perry. *Novel Relations: The Transformation of Kinship in English Literature and Culture, 1748 – 1818* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1.
[50] Melissa J Ganz 'Clandestine Schemes: Burney's *Cecilia* and the Marriage Act' *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation*, Vol 54 No.1 (Spring 2013), 25-6.
[51] Catherine Keohane, '"Too Neat for a Beggar": Charity and Debt in Burney's *Cecilia' Studies in the Novel, Vol. 33, No. 4 (Winter 2001),* 379-401, 379
[52] Burney, *Cecilia*, 55.
[53] Joyce Hemlow, 'Fanny Burney and the courtesy books,' *PMLA*, Vol 65, No. 5 (Sep., 1950), 732 – 761, 732
[54] J. Paul Hunter, *Before Novels: The Cultural Contexts of Eighteenth-Century English Fiction* (New York & London: W.W. Norton, 1990), 44, 95. Hunter's discussion of the importance of religious guidance in the formation of the novel is also important, see 265-6.

absolute subservience to their husband or father.[55] Such behaviour was supposed to help guard the adolescent woman from the 'wolfish' social predatory behaviour of men.[56] Frances Burney, as both Vessili and Hemlow have noted, read such texts voraciously. Her diaries are full of references to Fenelon, Madame De Genlis, Hannah More, and Mrs Chapone.[57] Vessili, moreover, suggests *Cecilia* itself should be read as a conduct novel.[58] *Cecilia's* plot therefore showcases the risks to a young woman's morality and explores how to both make sense of a fragile, post-revolutionary world.

Cecilia therefore tests these Anglican values. This is particularly explicit in Hannah More's early conduct literature. Her first publication of this sort, *Essays on Various Subjects, Principally Designed for Young Ladies* (1777) begins with a third person explanation that 'she by no means pretends to have composed a regular system of morals, or a finished plan of conduct' but only intends 'a few remarks' for young women about to enter the world.[59] This belies the comprehensiveness of More's approach, as she outlines in the preface to her *Sacred Dramas* of 1782 that she 'aspired after moral instruction, than the purity of dramatic composition' and avoiding 'acts' and 'scenes' she sought, as 'the sacred Historian' did, to 'represent[t] him as exhibiting no mean lesson of modesty, humility, courage, and piety: virtues not only admirable, but imitable; and within the reach of every reader.[60] More does not compose a 'regular system of morals' but rather a distinct type of 'dramatic composition.' J. Paul Hunter distinguishes the novel from its antecedent the courtesy book by arguing that novels are 'rooted in epistemology' unlike 'conduct books and treatise on contemporary manners' they prompt the reader to 'transcend their context', novels pleasurably ask 'what would it be like to be' rather than 'what does one do when faced with' a particular context.[61] More does not seek to form a sensible checklist of situations and behaviours, but rather attempts to form a way of being in the world that, in its performance, naturalises that way of

[55] Claudia Marina Vessilli, *Cecilia tra I <<courtesy books>> e la Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (Rome: Edizioni dell'ateneo & bizzarri: 1979), 13
[56] Vessili, *Cecilia tra I…,* 14
[57] Hemlow, 'Fanny Burney and the Courtesy Books,' 732.
[58] It is possible that Burney wrote at least her first two novels with these books in mind. Frances' journal entry of Wednesday September 29 1774 recounts at length how seriously her family took her joke that she intended to write a courtesy book for her family and friends at Samuel Crisp's house at Chesington. See Wednesday 29 1774, Lars E. Troide, ed. *The Early Journals and letters of Frances Burney,* Vol 2 (McGill-Queens University Press: Kingston and Montreal, 1990).
[59] Hannah More, *Essays on Various Subjects, Principally Designed for Young Ladies,* 5th ed. (London: T. Cadell, 1791), 2-3.
[60] Hannah More, *Sacred Dramas Chiefly Intended for Young Persons: The Subjects Taken from the Bible. To Which is Added, SENSIBILITY, A POEM (Dublin: P. Byrne, 1784),* vi-vii.
[61] J. Paul Hunter, *Before Novels,* 44.

being in the world. Like Mrs Chapone's instructions to her niece where she invites her to 'store your mind' with a 'thread' of 'the historical books of the old testament' she seeks to make new actors in 'sacred dramas' whose behaviours reinforce particular historical narratives.[62] In contrast to the instructional caricatures of its antecedents then, the eighteenth-century novel and drama-as-text instructs through ontology rather than epistemology, and in so doing seeks to naturalise a particularly Anglican ideology through the gendered bodies of its performers.

As Emma Major demonstrates, what appears to be a straitjacket of being nevertheless theoretically permitted a degree of social and political agency. The eighteenth-century Anglican Church was increasingly figured as a woman representing a golden mean of behaviour between the extremes of Catholicism and Puritanism.[63] Attempting to emulate this ideal of Anglican national womanhood 'allowed some women to see themselves as active agents in the shaping of the nation.'[64] Arbuthnot's foundational description of John Bull, meanwhile, described his mother:

> in the language of conduct books rather than theology, and she is brought to life through reference to a series of recognisable types of woman […] In *Cecilia*, Burney's heroine endeavours to seek out and practice the 'golden mean' of female polite behaviour despite being surrounded by a confusing array of fashionable types.[65]

What Major does not go on to explore, however, is the extent to which Cecilia's struggles to perform womanhood serve as a radical critique of this identity's place in the world in the context. This chapter, by contrast, asserts the centrality of the Anglican religious identity bestowed by her clergyman uncle's bequest to Cecilia's bildungsroman alongside critics' existing considerations of its social and economic clout. Cecilia's struggles to balance her fortune and her womanhood highlights not only existence of such a performance but teases out the links between the Anglican woman's performance and the stresses and strains of the economic and legal forces which underwrite her agency and delineate these polite bodies. As Joseph Roach remarked, 'players were despised' because 'performances provide the ways

[62] Hester Chapone, *Letters on the Improvement of the Mind* (Dublin: J. Exshaw, esq, 1773), 2.
[63] Emma Major, *Madam Britannia: Women, Church, and Nation, 1712 – 1812* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 32-3.
[64] Major, *Madam Britannia,* 2-3.
[65] Major, *Madam Britannia,* 36.

and means whereby a free born people can be formed.'[66] 'Viewing representations of actions that might or might not at any given moment be substituted for their own through repetition.' Mr Harrel's collapse in credit, the incursion of his creditors, and the fear of being found out as an imposter even as he is forced to sustain a reputation built on consumption and theatricality unto death thus reflect and intensify the fears of introducing Evelina to the milliners, merchants, and fashionable world while her grandmother lurks in the background. If Anglican courtesy literature was supposed to act as a guidebook to polite behaviour, then they simultaneously risked similarly collapsing the conceit of natural Protestant character on which Hanoverian legitimacy in part rested.

Bourdieu's concept of habitus clarifies how polite Anglican womanhood naturalised Hanoverian legitimacy along with more abstract ideas of liberty, moderation, commerce, and history. Habitus is the product of early economic and social conditions and norms, which in turn create the foundation of adult perceptions within a given field.[67] Habitus 'captures how we carry within us our history, how we bring this history into our present circumstances' and therefore how 'we are engaged in a continuous process of making history.'[68] If *Evelina* showed the imposition of these ideals, then *Cecilia* tests the ideals of the courtesy books in the world. Politeness is key. As Lawrence Klein argues, while politeness was 'an idiom for a wide range of people', both aristocratic, middling, and neither that was expressed in many different ways, it nevertheless cohered 'as a medium facilitating interaction and access to shared experience.'[69] For Alun Withey, politeness was not just a speech act, but rather a complicated set of processes which could be enacted on, and performed by, the body.[70] Here, too, Cecilia's expression of politeness is inextricable from the expression of modesty, sensibility, and decorum instilled by the courtesy books. But Cecilia's politeness is also, as Hester Chapone demonstrates and Bourdieu illuminates, an expression of, and inextricably bound up with, a particularly Anglican historical, cultural, and economic vantage point. Willingly or not then, Cecilia's body expresses and represents Anglican power through her

[66] Joseph Roach, *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 76.
[67] Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice,* trans. Richard Price (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 78.
[68] Karl Maton 'Habitus' in Michael Grenfall, ed. *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 48 – 64, 51.
[69] Lawrence E Klein, 'Politeness and the Interpretation of the British Eighteenth Century,' *The Historical Journal* Vol. 45. No. 4 (December 2002), 869 – 898, 873.
[70] Alun Withey, *Technology, Self-Fashioning, and Politeness in Eighteenth-Century Britain: Refined Bodies* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 43.

attempts to be 'polite.' Polite bodies become legible as polite because they express certain concepts of modesty, charity, and balance that are rooted in the propaganda surrounding the Protestant settlement. Klein's 'shared experience' creates and naturalises a contingent set of Anglican norms as intrinsically national qualities. Rather than Helen Barry's assertion that 'awareness of the importance of correct deportment and speech prescribed according to gender and status' ended up generating, rather than stymieing, 'a fascination with impolite behaviour,' Burney describes politeness not just as generating a 'fascination' with that difference, but instead naturalising it.[71]

The naturalisation of Anglican conceptions of British identity is critical to understanding a plot in which the Delviles are implied to be Catholic. If the name of Beverley suggests Anglicanism by very virtue of its clergyman source, then the name of Delvile is suspiciously Catholic. For Briggs the fashionable Mr Harrel is merely '[A] pretty guardian.' However, he wants to know:

> "where's t'other? Where's old Don Puffabout?"
> "If you mean Mr. Delvile, sir, I have not yet seen him."
> "Thought so. No matter, as well not. Only tell you he's a German Duke. Or a Spanish Don Ferdinand. Well you've me! poorly off else.' [72]

Briggs is quick to call Delvile by these names. Elsewhere he's a Spanish Don, then Don Vampus, 'his Grace the Right honourable Mr Vampus,' even 'my Lord Don Pedigree.'[73] For Barbara Zonitch, this scene typifies the contrast between new forms of credit, with the bourgeois merchant Briggs who in Julia Epstein's words 'conserves words as he does shillings,'[74] declaiming just how little Delvile's debased social credit of aristocracy means to his 'new bourgeois order.'[75] Megan Woodworth argues that Briggs here identifies Delvile with the Spanish aristocracy and absolutist monarchy to underscore just how far our ruling class has sunk 'from British ideals of Liberty.'[76] But the unnameable Catholicism here threatens to rise above the strained decorum. The Delvile family name is suspiciously if

[71] Helen Barry, 'Rethinking Politeness in Eighteenth-Century England: Moll King's Coffee House and the Significance of "flash" Talk,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Vol 11, (2001), 65-81, 67-8.
[72] Burney, *Cecilia*, 95.
[73] Burney, *Cecilia*, 753.
[74] Julia Epstein *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing* (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1989), 159.
[75] Zonitch, *Familiar Violence*, 62.
[76] Megan Woodworth, '"If a Man Dared act for himself": Family Romance and Independence in Frances Burney's *Cecilia' Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, Vol 22, No 2, (Winter 2009), 55-370, 365.

nebulously European, with the Spanish contraction 'Del' added to a corrupted form of the french 'Ville', mirroring Evelina's constructed surname of 'Anville'. Surnames were important for Burney; their contradictions reveal and reflect wider social fissures.[77] Eighteenth-century Catholic aristocrats were supposedly indistinguishable socially from the wider hinterland of the British Gentry, and Delvile boasts elsewhere that he is often to be seen in the London crowds; but Briggs's insistent slurs distinguish them from the wider Protestant gentry and resolutely identify them with Jacobite terror.[78] Politeness, then, rests on polite ignorance or silence of social difference and not its sublimation. Even if they no longer pose a tangible threat to the Hanoverian regime, Briggs' hints foreshadow Mr Monckton's later warning, and haunt Cecilia's experiences, that contact with the cousin-marriage family would mean she 'would very soon be totally weighed down by their united insolence.'[79] The Delviles may engage socially with Briggs, Monckton, and even with Dean Beverley, but their discordant histories rumble beneath their names and appearances in Anglican polite spaces.

Polite language thereby favours Anglican hegemony through its refusal to fully speak of continuing religious or social difference. Briggs' mockery of Delvile's faith becomes even more brazen as the novel continues. Eventually, Compton threatens him with the barely concealed challenge that 'no man of the name of Delvile brooks […] dishonour.' Further mockery concludes with Mr Briggs' calling out "Ay, Ay! Don Duke, poke in the old charnel houses by yourself, none of your defunct for me!' [80] Briggs co-opts the stately language of a restoration court to concurrently mock Delvile's lineage, faith, and credit as 'defunct': his once great family are nothing but 'bones and dust.' Despite his later remark that Delvile 'says his prayers' to 'all his old grand-dads', there is nothing to worship as saints there, his family contain no catholic relics, and there is no power in their martyrs.[81] His family 'honour' consists of the pure his identity figured in his name, which is always on the defensive; his socio-economic credit – and that of the Stuart line - is defunct. Briggs thus articulates an Anglican, British habitus, which silences Delvile through an implicit comparison of power which reminds Delvile of defeats and martyrdom that stain his British aristocratic identity.

[77] See: Epstein, *The Iron Pen*, 3; Kristina Straub, *Divided Fictions: Fanny Burney and Feminine Strategy* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1989), 2.
[78] Gabriel Glickman, *The English Catholic Community, 1688 – 1745: Politics, Culture, and Ideology* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), 79.
[79] Burney, *Cecilia*, 166.
[80] Burney, *Cecilia*, 454-5
[81] Burney. *Cecilia*, 753.

For Briggs, Delvile is inseparable from an Anglican version of his Catholic faith and the victor's view of the Jacobite threat. Indeed, the etymology of their names enshrine both men as religious stereotypes; the Saxon name of Briggs 'forthright, manly, honest and independent,' versus the Latinate 'sophisticated, popish,' Delvile.[82] The failure of politeness here further highlights the hegemonic character of what Klein describes as 'shared experience.' Briggs, the picture of protestant parsimony, can safely bend the rules of politeness. Yet Delvile finds politeness lacks a vocabulary with which to refute Briggs' bigotry without breaking social norms and risking outright violence.

The vast difference between Briggs and Delvile's speech thus suggests the difficulty of speaking of a coherent British society in the late eighteenth century. As Janet Sorenson points out, any attempt to speak of a British national language self-evidently collapses 'in the face of its historically chequered linguistic geographies.' [83] Yet 'the notion of an English national tongue consonant with England's national borders […] remains equally untenable.' Instead, elites sought to learn a polite 'proper English [that] could dampen the enflamed language of civil war and Jacobite rebellions' and unite an 'increasingly commercial community' in which social cohesion and Hanoverian hegemony was under threat.[84] Delvile repeatedly falls back on 'beautiful' and 'polite' language in an attempt to find some sort of common ground with Briggs. Yet with his social position so dominant, Briggs feels no need to speak an affected 'proper English.' Mr Delvile's endeavours to speak a common tongue, then, only amplify the chasm between their social positions. Indeed, it entrenches both; with Delvile hearing Briggs' speaking as an unpolished tradesman, and Briggs seeing no more value in Delvile's paroxysms of politeness than his mouldy ancestors.

The sectarian knowledge of Briggs' barely concealed hostility makes Delvile's reluctance to accept Cecilia, who speaks from the same habitus, more understandable. Four years before *Cecilia*'s publication, The Papists' Act of 1778 eased the provisions of the Act against Popery Act of 1700 to allow Catholics like Mortimer to inherit, dependent on their taking an oath of allegiance.[85] This in turn eased Catholics' reliance on a network of trusts run by

[82] Neil W Hitchen 'The Politics of English Bible translation in Georgian England' The Alexander Prize Essay in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* Sixth Series, Vol. IX (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 77.
[83] Janet Sorenson, *The Grammar of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 2.
[84] Sorenson, *The Grammar of Empire*, 141-2.
[85] Colin Haydon, *Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth-Century England, c. 1714-80: A Political and Social Study* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), 47.

Protestant friends.[86] The Delvile's fixation on cousin marriage, coupled with Compton's threats to disinherit Mortimer should he marry Cecilia, reflects early modern Catholic families tendency towards endogenous confessional kinship patterns.[87] For a family which have only their identity, inheritance and naming are inseparable. Accordingly, Mortimer's cousins' Catholicism is perhaps more strongly expressed than the Delviles. Lady Honoria comments to Cecilia that her sister is just as lukewarm at the prospect of marriage with Mortimer as he is, and would much prefer to become a nun.[88] Megan Woodworth argues Mortimer and Cecilia's struggles with agency are similar.[89] This is the case, not just for the reasons of kinship and marriage she assumes: Mortimer's agency is reduced not just by the simple fixation of cousin-marriage of his parents, but also by being the carrier for a long and precariously preserved Catholic identity. Cecilia, similarly, is a carrier for her Anglican uncle's name. Like the aristocratic name of Delvile, her name may grant her certain privileges, but the agency and stability she assumes is granted by her Anglican identity and its accompanying wealth comes at the expense of her being an unwitting representative of Protestant hegemony in the suspicious eyes of Mr Delvile.

Cecilia's confidence that she and Mr Delvile will share a common language is soon tested by her experience of his house. When early in the novel she meets Mr Delvile to beg leave to live with him, she is stunned into silence by his townhouse's grandeur.

> The house of Mr Delvile was grand and spacious, fitted up not with modern taste, but with the magnificence of former times, the servants were all veterans, gorgeous in their liveries, and profoundly respectful in their manners; everything had an air of state, but of a state so gloomy, that while it inspired awe, it repressed pleasure. [90]

This space is the anti-thesis of the Harrel's hotel-like house, which signals its legitimacy through novelty, consumption, and conspicuous credit. Coming a mere handful of pages after Mr Briggs' speech, it is a short step from his threats of Catholic tyranny to seeing in the 'inspired awe' of the 'magnificence of former times' and reified class system, the dark shadow of the Stuarts. As Karen Lipsedge noted, interior decoration became in the eighteenth

[86] Jonathan Clark, *From Restoration to Reform: The British Isles 1660 – 1832* (London: Vintage, 2014), 113.
[87] Glickman, *The English Catholic Community,* 63.
[88] Burney, *Cecilia,* 467.
[89] Woodworth, 355-6.
[90] Burney, *Cecilia,* 97.

century a powerful symbolic language with which the gentry could signal their taste.[91] For Delvile, it points to the social credit and power granted by his aristocratic lineage. Cecilia however, though left uneasy by the Harrel's excess, still has Briggs' Don Puffabout speech fresh in her mind. Dust, grandeur, and austerity carries a quite different meaning. Delvile does nothing to help matters, eager as he is to impress with his own social credit. Waving his hand to summon a chair while barely bothering to rise from his own, he begins by telling Cecilia how lucky she is to have been granted an audience:[92] As his name of 'del vile' might imply:

> At this time of day I am generally in a crowd. People of large connections have not much leisure in London, especially if they see a little after their own affairs, and if their estates, like mine, are dispersed in various parts of the kingdom.'[93]

What he considers to be a demonstration of his own social power however, in the context of Mr Briggs' gloss, could easily have been read by Cecilia as a reference to the Catholic estates in the north and his enduring recusancy. Indeed, this whole exchange dumbfounds her. Not that Mr Delvile notices: 'still imputing to embarrassment, an inquietude of countenance that proceeded merely to disappointment,' he 'imagined her veneration was every moment increasing.'[94] Indeed, in his attempts 'to give her courage,' he soon 'totally depressed her with mortification and chagrin.'[95] Although Cecilia has arrived to ask for permission to live with the family, she discovers the limits of female politeness and the impoliteness of Catholic spaces. Politeness, indeed any of the elements key to the courtesy books which were supposed to aid such social intercourse, are shown to be useless in the face of such an overwhelming social and cultural gap and multiple apparent proofs of Catholic tyranny that echo Mr Briggs' warnings of creeping mortification. The only polite option is silence.

Yet Delvile Castle, which appears to be incontrovertible proof of the Delvile's threat, is not what it seems.

---

[91] Karen Lipsedge, *Domestic Space in Eighteenth-Century British novels* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012), 22.
[92] Karen Harvey suggests that 'great chairs' were an integral part of the domestic masculinity. Mr Delvile here attempts to assert both his aristocratic and patriarchal authority over the newcomer while only further, in Cecilia's eyes, asserting his terror. Karen Harvey, *The Little Republic: Masculinity and Domestic Authority in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 132.
[93] Burney, *Cecilia*, 97.
[94] Burney, *Cecilia*, 98.
[95] Ibid.

> Delvile Castle was situated in a large and woody park, and surrounded by a moat. A draw-bridge which fronted the entrance was every night, by order of Mr Delvile, with the same care as if still necessary for the preservation of the family, regularly drawn up. Some fortifications still remained entire, and vestiges everywhere were to be traced of more; no taste was shewn in the disposition of the grounds, no openings were contrived through the wood for distant views or beautiful objects.[96]

Burney prompts the reader to recall gothic literature. She helpfully glosses the 'mansion house' as 'dark, heavy, and monastic' to invoke both a terrible aristocratic villain and those harbingers of tyranny, monks and nuns.[97] Yet Mr Delvile is no gothic villain; Burney describes architecture scarred by centuries of violence and penury. Their attempts to preserve their history through refusing to participate in the sociable marketplace therefore reflects not an austerity and seclusion intrinsic to Catholics, but an understanding of how fashionable material culture – while granting access to economic and social credit – would permit them to renovate only at the cost of erasing the evidence of their suffering under centuries of sectarian violence and legislation. The Delvile's proud gloominess and aloofness therefore reflect a the trauma inflicted on the great Catholic families among whom the Burneys circulated, for whom the invitation of sociability went far beyond acknowledging their loyalty to the King.

Indeed, *Cecilia* bears all the hallmarks of a novel scarred by the Gordon Riots. In June 1780 London and Bath witnessed the most violent anti-Catholic outburst of popular violence in decades. While the 1778 Papists Act passed without much disturbance, 'attempts to widen it to Scotland in 1779' were much less successful.[98] Lord George Gordon's Protestant Association presented a petition to parliament demanding its repeal. When it was dismissed out of hand, some '40,000 to 50,000 people […] gathered on London's St George's Fields.'[99] The riots ended only when the army killed at least 200 people and re-occupied the streets of London. The rioters' motivations have long been debated. Yet the fundamentally anti-papist nature of these protests at their origins must be asserted, even if we struggle to define what counted as 'popery.' Frances Burney was in Bath with Mrs Thrale when the riots broke out, and due to a newspaper notice that falsely accused Mr Thrale of Popery, they considered

---

[96] Burney, *Cecilia*, 457.
[97] As Cardinal Newman noted, 'the conventional impression of Catholic life in his day [was] typified by an "old fashioned house of gloomy appearance, with an iron gate." Catholic identity, then, was connected in the popular mind with a certain gothic aesthetic. Cardinal Newman, quoted in Edward Norman. *Roman Catholicism in England from the Elizabethan Settlement to the Second Vatican Council* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 3.
[98] Jerry White, *London in the Eighteenth Century: A Great and Monstrous Thing* (London: Vintage, 2012), 534.
[99] Ian Haywood and John Seed, 'Introduction' in Ian Haywood and John Seed, eds. *The Gordon Riots* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 1-18, 1.

themselves threatened.[100] Her letters home to her father, Charles, alongside her frantic familial concern, bear sympathetic witness to the sight of the 'poor persecuted' priest Charles Walmesley,[101] whom Burney recorded fleeing his blazing chapel.[102] Correspondence between Frances and her sister Susan echo this sympathy towards the 'poor innocent people, who, because they are Catholics, can have no hope of redress.' [103] Their father was even more explicit. In a letter to Thomas Twining, he damned the 'outrages' committed by Lord Gordon and his 'fanatics' and 'miscreants' and described how his Italian Catholic friends, performing at the Opera during the violence though 'guilty of a religion and country different to the mad bull, John, sang and danced with the utmost fear and trembling.'[104] With Burney beginning *Cecilia* with the riots and Catholic subjugation still fresh in her mind, it is no wonder that Delvile insists on raising his drawbridge.[105]

The Burney family were, moreover, intertwined with their Catholic neighbours. In Susan's account, she relates how '30 foot guards with an ensign at their head marched into the street.' Yet any hope they might have had is soon quashed:

> the daring populace appeared not the least alarmed, on the contrary they welcomed them with loud shouts & huzzas – The ensign made some speech to them – but I suppose he dared not oppose so many hundred people as were here assembled after a very short discourse with them, he turned round, & marched out of the street as he came into it, the Mob shouting & clapping the soldiers on their back as they passed & one of these even joined in the huzza. This was more alarming than any thing – for if the military power would not act, & was not feared by the populace, what chance did there seem to be of an End to the outrages they might be disposed to commit.[106]

With the threat of military control for the moment out of the question, the crowd turn their attentions back to the Burney's house. At first, Susan is nervous but unconcerned. Yet when one of the men denounced them as 'all three papists', Charles 'got his hat & Huzza'd from the window [though] it went against me to hear him.' This horror at their father repeating the

---

[100] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 136.
[101] Frances Burney to Dr Charles Burney, Friday Night, Bath, June 9th. In Frances Burney, *Journals and Letters,* Peter Sabor and Lars E Troide, eds. (London: Penguin, 2000), 164.
[102] Dom Aiden Bellenger, "'superstitious enemies of the flesh?' the variety of Benedictine responses to the enlightenment" in Nigel Aston, (ed), *Religious Change in Europe, 1650 – 1914: Essays for John McManners* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 149 – 160, 156 – 7.
[103] Susan Burney to Frances Burney, 8 – 12 June 1780, Egerton MS 3691 f. 132 – 142, British Library.
[104] Charles Burney to Thomas Twining 11 June 1780 in Charles Burney *The Letters of Charles Burney, Vol 1, 1551 – 1784* ed by Alvaro Ribeiro, SJ (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 301 – 312, 302, 306.
[105] See, for example, Kate Chisholm, *Fanny Burney: Her Life* (London: Vintage, 1998), 104-6; Claire Harman, *Fanny Burney: A Biography,* (London: Flamingo, 2000), 153 – 6.
[106] Susan Burney to Frances Burney, 8 – 12 June 1780, Egerton MS 3691 f. 132 – 142, British Library.

slogans of the anti-Catholic mob were not merely abstract. The Burney family both served, and were served by, Catholic families. Over the next few days, first Mrs Reynolds warn them that 'Mr Drummond,' whose daughter Charles taught music, was 'expected to be attacked that night – because his wife & family are catholic.' Their next visitor is one of their tenants 'whose wife keeps a china shop in one of the houses belonging to my father, just at the back of ours' who reports that they too are in danger. When Burney's stepmother asks why, he shamefully acknowledges they 'are papists.' Susan, however, reassures him that the Burneys 'are the last people who would wish you to be persecuted.' The Burney family therefore exist in a web of dependence with the English Catholic diaspora. But Susan also describes a material landscape in which the ecumenicism of daily life has fractured to reveal enduring sectarian divisions, and a city whose Catholic landscapes and buildings can once again be seen at the price of terrible violence.

In contrast to the returning xenophobia of the Seven Years War influenced *Evelina,* then, the introspective *Cecilia* is fascinated by the materiality and historicity of the English landscape. This places it firmly in the wake of the American Revolution. The dismay which followed the loss of the Thirteen Colonies is well attested. As Brendan Simms writes, 1778 – 1783 saw the end of the 'hubris' caused by the victories of the Seven Years War.[107] While Gibbon and Porteus both pointed to the influence of luxury, 'others blamed defeat on moral corruption, the machinations of the crown, ministerial corruption, or the lack of parliamentary representation.'[108] Britain now began a period of geographic shrinkage and moral examination. Having 'lost a continent', many voices clamoured for a regeneration of masculinity contra vice that could equip Britain to take its place across the channel in the continental system.[109] In this vein, Maya Jasanoff argues that the glut of loyalist refugees 'brought the social and material consequences of defeat straight to the empire's heart':

> Postwar Britain became the centre of a parallel process of reconstruction. Individual loyalists sought to re-establish themselves with financial aid and new positions, while British authorities set about reforming imperial government and expanding into new dominions – laying the foundations of the "spirit of 1783." But for all that these projects harmonised in many ways, loyalists in Britain ran up against one

[107] Brendan Simms, *Three Victories and a Defeat: The Rise and Fall of the First British Empire* (London: Penguin, 2008), 661-9.
[108] Ibid.
[109] Simms, *Three Victories, 666.*

> contradiction after another. Though they strongly identified as British subjects, they felt estranged in this foreign land. [110]

Colley's argument that it was the presence of Catholic France which spurred the development of British national identity in the second half of the eighteenth century therefore requires clarification. A reading inspired by Simms and Jasanoff would suggest that after the loss of the colonies in 1776,introspective attempts to refine and remake Britishness and its relationship to the Catholic and European past and present became critical. Cecilia's redoubled attempts at remaking herself along polite Anglican lines can be read as a reaction to the vices of debt, gambling, and luxurious consumption of Mr Harrel. Mr Harrel's suicide after the influx of creditors, meanwhile, becomes a metaphor for the destruction of the British body politic suffered in the wake of the American Revolution and loss of the thirteen colonies. Just as the creditors flood in to reclaim the cosmopolitan space of Mr Harrel's house, so too does the mob in the Gordon Riots seek to remake London in its own anti-Catholic image after the loss of the colonies and apparent failure of a multi-polar empire which, to some extent, excused the fuzzy national and religious boundaries of family life. In response to the fragility of an Englishness which relies on consumption and materiality to paper over the cracks of a landscape scarred by religious violence, Cecilia's fixation on conduct books points to a new moral, performative focus on nationalised and gendered bodies to remake cosmopolitan national identity. Yet while polite spaces are replaced by polite bodies, the reclaimed, contested spaces still lie fractured, revealing ever more clearly the violence and inequality they sought to obscure.

Cecilia's repeated difficulty in engaging socially with the Delvile family therefore underscores the failure of polite womanhood to unify a disjointed history and country. Female politeness in mixed company was theoretically mutually improving.[111] In the wake of the Gordon Riots, Susan Matthews argues this took on a new and vital social role 'Conservative social reforms saw women as agents of social control' able to enforce

[110] Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty's Exiles: The Loss of America and the Remaking of the British Empire* (London: Harper, 2011), 116.
[111] Michele Cohen, 'Manliness, Effeminacy, and the French: Gender and the Construction of National Character in Eighteenth-century England,' in Hitchcock and Cohen, *English Masculinities, 1660 – 1800* (Harlow: Addison, Wesley, Longman, 1999), 44 – 67, 57 – 8.

'civilised values' through example.[112] Matthews goes on to argue that Burney's letters prove 'sympathy fuels Burney's anxiety about the death of rioters and this potentially betrays her class position.'[113] Accordingly, she argues, we must read *Cecilia* as 'another response to the Gordon Riots' and the limits of bluestocking 'mental self-regulation.'[114] Politeness was therefore supposed to grant Anglican women a limited social role in uniting a fractured society. What Cecilia's encounter with Mr Delvile, and Mr Delvile's encounter with Mr Briggs makes clear, however, is that Burney remained fundamentally sceptical about the role of the polite Anglican woman to fix these deep social, economic, and religious divisions, when politeness itself – as a cultural performance - embodied an Anglican state still concerned with its own historical precarity.

Yet as Mr Delvile understands, sustaining these divisions permits the family to retain some semblance of English Catholic identity in the face of fashionable life. This is not just the case in terms of cousin marriage. Delvile castle is in a state of acute disrepair. While 'some fortifications still remained entire' most were crumbling:

> The grandeur of its former inhabitants was every where visible, but the decay into which it was falling rendered such remains mere objects for meditation and melancholy[.] [115]

The narrator's eye naturally looks for 'distant views and beautiful objects', but instead finds only 'monastic' gloom and decay. As Stephen Copley and Peter Garside have pointed out, the picturesque was a deeply political category, and foundational to later gothic and romantic categories.[116] That Delvile Castle is a curated reaction against the picturesque is suggested by how Mr Delvile is said to be 'more supportable here than in London.'[117] Ruined castles threatened to remind the reader of the violent roots of modernity, of a time when Hanoverian power was neither settled nor assured.[118] His castle is inextricable from the protestant violence that haunts him. Delvile's more relaxed behaviour, however, is not just generated by

---

[112] Susan Matthews, "'Mad Misrule': The Gordon Riots and Conservative Memory,", in Ian Haywood and John Seed, eds. *The Gordon Riots* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 226 – 242, 230.
[113] Matthews, 'Mad Misrule,' 231.
[114] Ibid.
[115] Burney, *Cecilia*, 457
[116] Stephen Copley and Peter Garside, 'Introduction,' in Stephen Copley and Peter Garside, eds. *The Politics of the Picturesque: Literature, Landscape, and Aesthetics since 1770* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 1 – 13, 1, 6.
[117] Burney, *Cecilia*, 458.
[118] Anne Janowitz, *England's Ruins: Poetic Purpose and the National Landscape* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 3.

the physical protection of the drawbridge. Rather, it stems from his environment; a paradoxically curated abandonment of the behaviour which maintains his status in society. Through ensuring his land remains 'dark, heavy, and monastic', he removes himself from the narrator's enlightenment gaze that sought to 'measure, examine, commodify, and objectify human subjects who represented the unknown and unenlightened.'[119] British Protestants often viewed Catholics as 'unenlightened' and thus 'opposed to the enlightenment and its spirit of improvement and against advances in art.'[120] The lack of beautiful views is not just a by-product of poverty caused by the wider penal laws, but a conscious resistance to modern protestant society transfixed by light and beauty. Mr. Delvile thus creates a monastic space as refuge against politeness. Not hiring a fashionable landscaper is a way for a man of little economic and social credit to radically reverse modernity, and in so doing assert his Catholic identity over and against the bourgeois spaces dominated by Mr Briggs. The Delviles' castle is not just a simple geographic Catholic space then, but a radical area of monastic retreat from an enlightened aesthetic state, soaked in capital. It is little wonder that Mr Delvile seeks to preserve it at all cost.

Lady Honoria's suggestion that they solve their financial problems by 'mak[ing] some capital alterations to this antient castle' and turning it into the county gaol are inevitably poorly received. Such alterations, she assures them, would take very little effort 'It is only to take out these old windows, and fix some thick iron grates in their place. And so turn the castle into a gaol for the county."[121] Mortimer laughs. But Mr Delvile retorts that if Mortimer considered such an 'insult to his ancestors' he would be immediately and permanently banished. The generational differences here are stark. Despite the language of 'capital' and 'austerity' in which this discussion is framed, these differences are neither straightforwardly economic nor secularly punitive. Rather, Delvile, Cecilia, and Honoria are so well soaked in the assumptions of Anglican ideology that they are unable to see what the family would lose in such a trade, and instead see it only in terms of a litany of lost benefits. Mr and Mrs Delvile by contrast understand not just that exchanging the Castle for a more fashionable spot in town would be inextricable from 'banishment' and the end of his line, but that turning the

[119] Julie Parks, *The Self and It: Novel Objects in Eighteenth-Century England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010), 206-7.
[120] Rena Denton, 'Enlightened Thought Devised from Biblical Principals' in Robert D Cornwall and William Gibson (Eds.) *Religion, Politics, and Dissent, 1660 – 1832* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010, 51 – 64, 53.
[121] Burney, *Cecilia*, 505.

Castle into a 'county goal' would be not just to relinquish his family history, but an 'insult to his ancestors' who have suffered for their faith in the gaols of Protestant England.

William Blackstone's *Commentaries* (1765 – 1769) further demonstrates how Burney uses the Delvile's castle as a space in which to discuss the sectarian reach of the law.. For Blackstone:

> Our system of remedial law resembles an old gothic castle, erected in the days of chivalry but fitted up for a modern inhabitant. The moated ramparts, the embattled towers, and the trophied halls, are magnificent and venerable, but useless and therefore neglected. The interior apartments, now accommodated to daily use, are cheerful and commodious, though their approaches may be winding and difficult.[122]

This metaphor rapidly became popular.[123] It is, moreover, present in Delvile's Castle. In Burney's subversive estimation however, Delvile's monastic space stands beyond metaphor. Insisting upon the land, it proclaims its ruin *under* the laws, and thus the legal foundation of what others take for supposed gothic tyranny. With Blackstone's legal metaphor in mind, we have the context required to explain Mr Delvile's otherwise bafflingly disproportionate outburst: Mr Delvile, who would have lived through the '45 rising and the ensuing repression, takes its endurance as a sign of strength. The prospect of turning Delvile Castle into a county gaol is not just risible , but 'an insult upon his ancestors' who risked incarceration for their faith. Despite Lady Honoria's claim that with the money 'he might have some place a little more pleasant to live in, for really that old moat and draw-bridge are enough to vapour him to death',[124] she fails to understand that its apparent decay and gloom is the point; it stands as an enduring testimony to the state violence that continues to be enacted on the Delvile family and problematizes his self-proclaimed ease in London crowds. To turn it into a gaol, a word he insists she no longer uses 'for it implies an idea that either the family, or the mansion, is going into decay,' and exchange it for a 'pretty neat little box somewhere near Richmond' would erase the family's Catholic identity. [125] It is hardly surprising then that the penalty for his son's sale of the castle would be the same should be marry Cecilia: banishment from his father's 'presence forever.'[126]

---

[122] William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England, in Four Books*, Vol. 3. (London: T. Cadell, 1794) 268.
[123] Bridget M Marshall, *The Transatlantic Gothic Novel and the Law, 1790 – 1860* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 4.
[124] Burney, *Cecilia*, 506.
[125] Ibid.
[126] Burney, *Cecilia*, 505.

Mrs Delvile's interactions with Cecilia show a Catholic woman attempting to use politeness against Anglican hegemony. Cecilia's encounter with the Delvile's house comes immediately after a rancorous meeting with Briggs. Accordingly, the monastic air of Delvile Castle makes Cecilia feel profoundly uneasy. Mrs Delvile however, is aware of her guest's emotions, and the first thing she does upon Cecilia's arrival is to take:

> all possible care to make the apartments and situation of Cecilia commodious and pleasant, and to banish by her kindness and animation the gloom and formality which her mansion inspired.[127]

While the 3rd person omniscient narrator cannot help but see the discordance of histories at play here, Mrs Delvile appreciates the importance of selective viewing, of curating one's public persona. Michael Charlesworth's reading of Anne Radcliffe's *The Romance of the Forest* (1791) is particularly illuminating. He argues that the heroine Adeline's group's experience of a ruined abbey demonstrates the link between proximity to the visible ruins of Catholic religious buildings and the heroine's gothic shudders:

> In one set of rooms – the modern ones fitted up within the ancient shell – they can live tolerably without too many irrational fears. It is in the other set – those of the ancient abbey itself – that can drag them back from the comforts of their modern anti-superstitional derision to the screaming spirits of terror. [128]

Mrs Delvile demonstrates a perfect awareness of the dangerous cultural background of her guest. She wants to ensure they speak in a familiar enlightenment space, away from a monastic gloom of ruins which at best prompts Whiggish guilt, and which Anglican popular culture teaches its young women to self-defensively interpret as proof of intrinsic ideological tyranny.[129] As Jan Broadway and Michael Questier have shown, Catholic women were the critical hubs around which Early Modern Catholicism survived.[130] Burney describes this continuing long into the eighteenth century. Mrs Delvile, therefore, is much more gracious

[127] Burney, *Cecilia*, 457
[128] Michael Charlesworth, 'The Ruined Abbey: Picturesque and Gothic Values' in Stephen Copley and Peter Garside, eds. *The Politics of the Picturesque: Literature, Landscape, and Aesthetics Since 1770* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 62 – 80, 75.
[129] Ibid.
[130] Jan Broadway 'Agnes Throckmorton: a Jacobean Recusant Widow' in Peter Marshal and Geoffrey Scott (eds) *Catholic Gentry in English Society: The Throckmortons of Coughton from Reformation to Emancipation* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2008), 123 – 143, 123 -4. Jan Broadway cites Michael Questier here.

than her husband was at their first introduction and demonstrates fluency in polite norms. Catholic sociability depended on Catholic women's ability to negotiate sectarian public spheres. Unlike her husband's first ostentatious display of power – recall his haughty boasts about his estates - she understands that graciousness and politeness is a sort of selective curation of identity. For interactions between Catholics and Protestants, this self-editing is critical if Anglicans, inculcated in Gothic literature and anti-papist and Jacobite propaganda, are not to misread the gloom of history for anti-enlightenment tyranny. This suggests, moreover, that Mrs Delvile believes monastic retreat and spaces of enlightenment sociability can overlap, that it is indeed plausible to juggle an understanding of the past with a full engagement with those of different faiths.

Yet Burney understands that the religious and economic hegemony behind politeness mean that Catholic women can no longer negotiate their way through Protestant supremacy. After hundreds of pages of equivocation, Mrs Delvile confronts Cecilia and Mortimer with their plans to marry. At first, it appears as if her appeal to family duty will convince the couple to part. Mrs Delvile calls on shared experience of polite womanhood, and it is an appeal to this which triumphs: 'I will not have the misery of involving him in repentance, nor of incurring the reproaches of the mother he so much reverences.'[131] A horrified Mortimer demonstrates just how close to Cecilia's weltanschauung he is, as he allies parental to catholic tyranny, lamenting a 'compliance to which not merely my happiness, but my reason must be sacrificed.'[132] His mother invokes the blood debt of their ancestors, inviting him to imagine 'the blood of your wronged ancestors rising into your guilty cheeks […] when wished joy upon your marriage by the name of Mr Beverley.' The appeal to blood seems to work, and he tells his mother, 'you have conquered.' But it is not over. At the sight of Cecilia, he declaims:

> "I cannot, I will not give her up! – nor now, madam, nor ever! – I protest it most solemnly! I affirm it by my best hopes! I swear it by all I hold sacred!" Grief and horror next to frenzy […] rose in the face of Mrs Delvile, who, striking her hand upon her forehead, cried, "My brain is on fire!" and rushed out of the room. [Mortimer] following her thither […] saw her extended, upon the floor, her face, hands and neck all covered with blood![133]

[131] Burney, *Cecilia*, 675.
[132] Burney, *Cecilia*, 676. Mortimer also makes the curious distinction between 'religion and the laws of our country' when he asks and dismisses plausible reasons for denying their marriage.
[133] Burney, *Cecilia*, 680.

He ‘protests’, he ‘affirms’, he ‘swears’ his love by all he holds ‘sacred!’ There are striking similarities in the careful repetition of ‘promise,’ and ‘swear’ here with the oath of allegiance Catholics were required to take if they wished to inherit after 1778.[134] But rather than ‘guilty blood’ rising in Mortimer’s cheeks when called Beverley, it is ancestral blood that surges from his ‘conquered’ mother. Mrs Delvile implausibly recovers. But Burney’s message is clear: politeness creates pluralistic social spaces only when it is expressed on an enlightened stage and ignores its violent foundations. It is the language of hegemony. Because it brings people together only when they channel hegemonic behaviour, the enduring social divisions which led to the Gordon Riots can only be repeatedly suspended, rather than truly resolved.

Mrs Delvile’s bloody seizure reinforces the particular pressures of embodying Hanoverian supremacy on a Catholic body. Juliet McMaster has catalogued the effect propriety had on Burney’s heroines as ‘the English malady’ of nervousness became ‘the female malady’:

> The female difficulties Burney dramatizes are many and various, […] But the most notable difficulty of all is the lack of a voice. […] Burney reinforces the social message on the tax that propriety exacts from women with a medical warning too. To stifle expression, to deprive a woman of a proper vent for her nervous disorder, is to risk illness and insanity.[135]

Mrs Delvile has struggled to bend ‘politeness’ to her will to keep Cecilia out of the family and preserve their own fragile identity. Yet the demands of embodying Anglican hegemony alongside her own are as insurmountable as Mr Harrel finds bankruptcy. Nor is the agony Mrs Delvile suffers representative of a wider tendency in Burney’s novels towards ‘self-wounding’ or straightforwardly ‘aggressive.’[136] Mrs Delvile’s body breaks down not just by performing politeness akin to Hannah More’s early conduct dramas, but is ritually broken down by the contradictions of articulating an Anglican discourse to defend a Catholic patrimony. If politeness as a set of behaviours puts almost intolerable strain on Cecilia as she encounters a Catholic power and past both powerful and subservient to the Anglican present, then it is little surprise that Mrs Delvile, who dares to speak most directly of the chasm and blood separating the two families, is herself the first to be broken down.

---

[134] William David Evans, ed. *A collection of Statutes Connected with the General Administration of the Law,* vol 5. (London: Saunders and Benning, 1829), 42.
[135] Juliet McMaster, *Reading the Body in the Eighteenth-Century Novel* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004), 2-3.
[136] Zonitch, *Familiar Violence,* 87.

The predominance of 'fire' and 'blood', moreover, marks a return to a lurking pre-modernity. Thomas Laqueur highlights how Renaissance bodies were understood through a one sex model. Male and female identity were based on dispersions of fluid. '[C]old men [were] less fecund' and likely 'to suffer menstrual-like bleeding', while 'cold women' might endure 'surplus blood' leading to 'barrenness [and] hysteria.' A midwife might thus treat infertile women by rubbing and warming the vulva.[137] By the eighteenth century, by contrast, 'sex as we know it was invented.'[138] Such an invention of 'incommensurable difference' involved 'an explicit repudiation' of the idea that 'nuanced differences between organs, fluids, and physiological processes mirrored a transcendental order of perfection.' Mrs Delvile's traumatic menstruation, precipitated by such a warming 'my brain is on fire!' thereby marks a sudden, traumatic unravelling of this new eighteenth-century order. Crushed by the strains of being Anglican, Mrs Delvile's body returns not to Catholic womanhood, but becomes dangerously un-sexed. This Galenic effusion of blood marks not just a return to a pre-modern body, but also raises the spectre of pre-modern religious violence. This, paradoxically, only further marks her Catholic body out as an unnatural un-sexed substance. Her attempts to use polite behaviour to moderate the state apparatus it embodies has thus failed. Not only has she nearly lost her womanhood, life and her son, but even this suffering only further reifies her as a superstitious Catholic, unfit for the ordered enlightened era.

After a short period apart, Cecilia and Mortimer resolve to break Cecilia's name clause and instead hide from her uncle's lawyers. After several false starts, they marry. Cecilia Delvile, however, is immediately hounded by lawyers, demanding to know her surname.[139] Mortimer mistakes a meeting between Mr Belfield and his wife for an affair and abandons her. Turned away by Mr Delvile, she flees through the streets of London in search of her husband until 'the distraction of her mind' and 'the inflammation of fatigue, heat, and disappointment' meant she 'scarce felt her own motion' and, adrift, finds herself in an 'open shop.' [140] Having lost her capital and disowned by her new family, Cecilia is at last unchained from the capital and ideology that predicate her the performance of Anglican womanhood. 'The distraction of

[137] Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990), 106-7.
[138] Laqueur, *Making Sex,* 149.
[139] With names functioning as a metaphor for identity in Burney's novels, such a demand only further underscores the extent to which the lawyers demand to resolve Cecilia's legal identity. This, of course, further points to the extent that Anglican womanhood is a constructed legal identity rather than a natural characteristic.
[140] Burney, *Cecilia,* 897.

her mind ever growing greater' precipitates her inability to converse with society. Although hands 'caught […] her riding habit' to correct her movements, the upheaval caused by the image of spilled blood engenders a dislocation between mind and uncontrollable body. The city loses its legibility and 'with no consciousness of any plan', Cecilia passes from the ordered shared space of Anglican Enlightenment into 'supernatural speed' that marks her final break from her previous owners. With the last remains of her capital stripped from the pockets by the hands of the mob, she is ready to be sold in 'a yet open shop' where, advertised in a newspaper for the hope of a reward, she becomes the subject of the text, rather than its reader.

Burney nevertheless sees a path towards a resolution between Catholic and Protestant histories. First Albany – the man she employed to carry out her charity – then Mortimer, and finally Mr Delvile pay their respects, with both latter men lamenting the chances they have missed to save her life. True repentance for Mr Delvile, however, comes:

> at first sight of the bed and the attendants, [he] was hastily retreating; but the changed and livid face of Cecilia caught his eye, and, struck with sudden consternation, he involuntarily stopt.
> "Look at the poor young lady!" cried Dr Lyster; "can you wonder a sight such as this should make Mr Mortimer forget every thing else?"
> She was wholly insensible, but perfectly quiet; she seemed to distinguish nothing, and neither spoke nor moved. [141]

Forcing Mr Delvile to 'look at the poor young lady,' Dr Lyster prompts Mr Delvile to incorporate Cecilia into a new Catholic male gaze. Mr Delvile relents. Cecilia recovers. Lacking her inheritances, she is welcomed into an ancient family to rival that of her late parents. She is also granted a sufficient income by Mrs Delvile's sister, impressed by her virtue, to resume a restricted version of her charitable giving. For Terry Castle, Cecilia is 'the object of an uneasily disguised collective necrophilia' and the only reason the Delviles accept her is that, having seen her 'stilled, and silent', she can be admitted to the 'phantasmic family of the dead.'[142] This perspective however seems a little too restricted to Mr Briggs' perspective of the old grandees. Mr Delvile is not just visiting the corpse of female agency but venerating the 'livid' body of a young martyr who has re-enacted the suffering endured

[141] Burney, *Cecilia*, 911-2.
[142] Terry Castle, *Masquerade and Civilisation: The Carnivalesque in Eighteenth-Century Fiction* (London: Methuen, 1986), 202.

by his own wife at Cecilia's hands. Catholic suffering is balanced by Anglican suffering. This absolution, moreover, occurs in a shop; a space of bourgeois credit in which Briggs himself would be comfortable. This scene is thus quietly radical, if only on its own terms. A Catholic man venerates an Anglican woman in Catholic – even Marian - terms in enemy territory. Spiritually amalgamated, she can be welcomed into his monastic space of resistance.

Julie Parks articulates a common criticism when she argues that the small inheritance left to Cecilia by Mrs Delvile's sister typifies the 'weak and ambiguous' endings.[143] If we read this novel solely in secular terms, then this would indeed be accurate. In a purely financial sense Cecilia and the Delviles have lost. Couverture meant that upon marriage, her wealth and identity transferred to Mortimer.[144] Yet the anti-Richardsonian ending, in which the family unites around her body to welcome her into Catholic life, rather than around a coffin to lament their rejection, points to a plausible reconciliation.[145] Politeness cannot bridge all cultural gaps precisely because it only expresses hegemony. Cecilia can only be accepted if she can articulate an Anglicanism free of historic prejudices. Just as it is absurd to expect the Delvile family to accept the destruction of their identity in return for a few thousand pounds, it is surely absurd, Burney argues, to expect a handful of economic concessions to be worth much to English Catholics who still carry with them the scars and memories of centuries of bloodshed into each sociable encounter. Such economic concessions would only be the final act of supremacy.

Cecilia's rebirth into a Catholic family thus mirrors Mr Harrel's bankruptcy and death. It is only when her social and economic credit has become 'defunct', the material culture of her identity fractured, and the landscape illegible that she can be reborn. In contrast to *Evelina* then, *Cecilia* underscores the importance of the marketplace and consumption to the preservation of Anglican hegemony. Yet rather than, pace Smith and Hume, underscoring the liberty and security of a free, commercial society, Burney sees only the vagaries of a volatile marketplace that elides bankruptcy and death. Not only can the Hanoverian contract of liberty, restraint, moderation, and economic growth not be fulfilled however, the logic of politeness leads inexorably to the return of violence. This chapter therefore suggests not only that politeness is an embodied and naturalising performance of Hanoverian conceptions of

[143] Parks, *The Self and It*, 132.
[144] Amy Louise Erickson, 'Coverture and Capitalism' *History Workshop Journal*, No. 59 (Spring, 2005), 4.
[145] Karen Lipsedge, *Domestic Space*, 86-7.

economic, historical, and theological doctrines, but that politeness worked to naturalise Hanoverian legitimacy over and above the enduring local and historic identities of the nation's inhabitants. It is no wonder then that politeness is repeatedly shown to be useless when Burney's women attempt to use it to negotiate with the status quo. Her experiences during The Gordon Riots have left their mark. Unlike *Evelina,* there can be no writing back against her uncle's will. The explosion of laws described by Lemmings does not just reflect the discordance between the late Hanoverian state's claims to dominance and the morass of competing local and national identities, but also how these circulating legal texts are inextricable from the predominance of patriarchal violence. To return to the Gordon Riots, it is not the law which matters when it comes to taking back control of the street. Rather, it is the ability of the fiscal-military state to exert power over the mob. Those who have a monopoly of violence, Burney argues in a Hobbesian manner, do not just control the streets. They also write the law, impose order, underwrite the economy, define the faith, and scope out the very limits of language. Burney is not criticising this per se, but rather is constantly afraid of the Hanoverian state's ability to maintain this power, to keep its soldiers in the street.

In contrast to *Evelina*, then, Burney's experience of the Gordon Riots and beginning of the 1780s appears to have led to a much more pessimistic understanding of the uses of politeness. If Evelina can balance the messy inheritances, histories, and loyalties of a world still haunted by Jacobite claims, Cecilia cannot. This underscores the fundamental novelty of Politeness, and how it is bound up with the totalitarian claims of the state under George III. Early Modern Catholic women like Agnes Throckmorton may have been able to negotiate between the Protestant state and their Catholic families to ensure their survival, but Mrs Delvile's attempts lead only to her near death. It is Protestant violence and economic credit which underwrite the rules, not Christian virtue. It is only when she renounces polite identity with all its supremacy that she can become Cecilia Delvile, and so it is only when the crown acknowledges the messy history of Britain and Catholic identities therein that the threat of violence can recede. Indeed, that Cecilia's moderate charitable spending can resume thanks to an inheritance from an impressed relative of the Delviles points to a deeper and radical continuity between Catholic and Anglican Christianities, and the ecumenical Christian duty of moderation, charity, and interdependence.

Chapter three: '[Y]ou must break the blood vessel: But not sneeze': Frances Burney at Court, 1786-91

Frances Burney's *Court Journals* have long been acknowledged for the insights they offer into the domestic life of the court. But they are also self-consciously literary documents, in some cases redrafted months or years after the events they describe.[1] Nevertheless, Burney's description of life at court is as novel and perceptive as it is linked to the concerns of her previous writing. It should be seen as a continuance of, rather than absence from, the intellectual climate of the world outside as she attempts to make sense of the chaos of a court of contradictions and chaos. Critical here is this chapter's argument that Queen Charlotte's summoning of Burney to court was part of her attempt to create an intellectual coterie modelled on her experiences as the secular canoness of a Lutheran Abbey in Westphalia. Just as Richard Cambridge sought to add the author of *Evelina* and *Cecilia* to his own literary family, so too did Queen Charlotte add Burney to a lively intellectual court. Contra Mary Astell however, Charlotte's visions of court-convent life offered no freedom for Burney or the Princesses, and the Queen's ability to step between confessions upon marriage or find a degree of freedom in adhering to gendered ideals would not extend to Frances or her daughters. As such, this chapter argues Frances' account of her 'monastic environment' and her traumatic account of the King's illness marks a decisive rejection of the possibility of community or resistance through scrupulous adherence to politeness.

At first, the promise of an escape from the pressures of the world must have sweetened the bitter pill of immuration. A failed courtship with George Owen Cambridge which seemed to

[1] Lorna J. Clarke points out that 'The oft-quoted description of Burney's method made soon after her arrival at Windsor – that she keeps memorandums by her, written up as leisure later, is more a statement of intent than actual practice: she was usually twelve to fifteen months behind in writing up her journal,' but that it nevertheless served as a 'writer's notebook.'
Lorna J. Clark, 'Frances Burney's Methods of Narrating the Court Experience' *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 40. No. 2. (2017), 223 – 235, 224, 228.
Hester Davenport in turn argues that the 'fictional narrative' of her journals was 'unhelpful', as were Burney's own comments that 'it seemed as if she was copying scenes from Evelina and Cecilia', as Burney 'did not confuse life with art.'
Hester Davenport, *Faithful Handmaid: Fanny Burney at the Court of George 3rd* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2000), 132.

pivot more on his literary father seeking to add the by now famous Frances to his bustling family salon had fizzled out. Her father had suffered his own disappointments. The offer of granting his daughter a place at court was a consolation prize for Charles and terrifying for Frances. Nevertheless, the Hanoverian court had long been a vibrant intellectual centre. Under Queen Charlotte's enlightened womanhood, motherhood legitimated a vibrant intellectual life. Burney heard the Queen express sympathy for Catholics, dismiss the falsity of polite identity, and express intense scientific and historical curiosity. Yet if George I and II and their wives were able to distinguish private and public beliefs, this in no way mitigates the pressures of court performance for King George III and Queen Charlotte. Again, Burney implies a distinctive schism took place as the threat of the Stuarts eased, attention shifted away from the Thirteen Colonies, and towards the home country. The King and Queen's legitimacy ever-more hinged on their public performance of virtuous domesticity and enlightened womanhood. Their legitimacy and the social order in constant play, they suffered the same traumas as Burney's heroines. Economic, social, and royal systems of credit were inextricable – and dependent on the public trust in the ability of the monarch to sustain British liberty. Frances, too, found no trauma in this quasi-monastic space. Its artificial behaviours, rigid timetables, and denial of bodily realities and romantic life outside were unbearable. Worse, there was no time to study and barely enough time to write. Metaphors of automation and puppetry only intensify, and Astell's Protestant convents slip into gothic monasteries of Radcliffe and Walpole, and in this transformation the conflation of Stuart and Hanoverian tyranny raised its head.

Yet as the King's body began to break down, so too did social order. The King's need to show himself in public lead inevitably to an assassination attempt, in which a disturbed woman whose knife was hidden in a petition is glossed by Frances as a Humean attack on popular legitimacy. Similarly, while one might expect Frances to take her friend Burke's position on the Hastings' trial, the theatrical logic of her eye-witness accounts of the trial is that it threatens to either legitimise the imposition of the morality he lacked – or, worse, undermine the legitimacy of the crown and cause tumult at home. The risks of indebted sociability are balanced against the risks of a wider social breakdown if such a façade collapses. As the King grew sicker, Burney chooses the Devil she knew. Dr Willis's attempts to remould the king's body through discipline and instruction are described by Burney in terms akin to her heroines learning polite identity. Intertextuality and the bleeding together of different genres therefore becomes a way for Burney to make sense of different ways of

looking at the world and reading history. By bringing in her own earlier writing on learning acceptable identity to make sense of the King's illness, her meditation on the King's public and sociable body again demonstrates the interconnected fragility of this national embodiment. As she describes the trauma and pain of 18 hour days of servitude and isolation, she in turn reveals how this psychiatric and physical bodily trauma is inextricable from national memory. Each embodied act of sociability naturalises Britishness but fails to repress the scars left by centuries of violence. The ability or not of George to carry out the demands of Kingship becomes, in turn, a worrying expose of both the fragility of such virtuousness and how much depends on his ability to perform it. Britain and Britishness are fragile things, reflected and embodied in both royal and polite bodies which, like its colonies, are on the verge of breaking down once and for all.

Her unambiguous love for the King and Queen is therefore balanced by an enduring horror at how they, too, are trapped by the necessity of theatrical performance writ large. Compared with the old great chain of being, the dependence of Hanoverian sovereignty on continual demonstration of moderation, peace, and liberty places the social order on a constant knife-edge. Though enduring eighteen-hour days, she thought, wrote, and reflected to the point of exhaustion. Her experimentation with form and genre attempted to make sense of the world around her. The character of her account of her years at court in turn points not to these diaries and letters as novelistic – a genre she rejected – but rather as a way of writing which permitted her to interrogate history and ideology through experimenting with genre in a space between romance, drama, epistle, courtesy book, and novel. Burney's experimentation with genre was therefore intensification of her writing back against ways of reading history and legitimacy which were inextricably bound up with genre.

The ten years after the publication of *Cecilia* saw profound emotional trauma as relationships simmered and failed in the public eye. As Stewart Cooke has argued, the prospect of a marriage to George Owen Cambridge was driven in part by Richard Cambridge's desire to incorporate Frances' literary fame into his own family.[2] For Charles, although the dowry would have been expensive, the match would have been fortuitous. Richard Cambridge was a well-liked and well-known 'scribbler'. The association between the Burneys and Cambridges would therefore offer professional opportunities while relieving him of the anxiety of Frances' future. For Frances however, the marriage to a clergyman would have meant the end to publication, and to an increase on the pressures of orthodox gender and religious roles.[3] Whatever the truth, the relationship – or the prospect of it – went nowhere. It would have been unthinkable for Frances to be the active party in pushing forward the match, and George was puzzling unwilling to push the matter forward. Frances was reduced to obsessively recording his every movement, until mention in print and from the Tory hostess Mrs Ord led to a decisive break.[4] Worse, the fact that the failed relationship was public knowledge drove Frances into what can only be described as akin to a nervous breakdown. Each social engagement, each appearance in society now risked either embarrassingly meeting the Cambridge family and being surveilled by society or enduring the whispers and witticisms of the ton. There now seemed no prospect of escaping life at home. While her earnings from her second novel outstripped those of *Evelina*, they still fell well-short of granting Frances independence.

Meanwhile, her friendship with Mrs Thrale had descended into acrimony over the question of her remarriage to an Italian Catholic.[5] Henry Thrale died in 1781. By 1782, Hester was unable to keep her infatuation secret, and Frances bore the brunt of her desire to speak. Although 'she was keen to appear sympathetic' she soon joined Queeney in horror at the impropriety as the affair dragged on and 'the spectacle of a mature woman giving vent to passionate feelings' continued.[6] Eventually, she wrote an explicit plea to Hester, in which she implored her to enjoy her widowhood and not to give in to 'passion over Reason':

---

[2] Stewart Cooke, *Frances Burney and the 'Cantabs', ECL*, 42:2, 2018, 94-111, 95.

[3] W.M Jacob suggests that while clergy wives could act as research assistants for their husbands' scholarly work, they were also expected to fulfil a public role as a guide for women of the parish. W.M Jacob, *The Clerical Profession in the Long Eighteenth Century 1680 - 1840* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 158-9.

[4] Claire Harman, *Fanny Burney: A Biography* (London: Harper Collins, 2001), 184; Chisholm, 123.

[5] Kate Chisholm, *Fanny Burney: Her Life* (London: Vintage, 1999), 126-7.

[6] Harman, 174-5; see also her increasingly panicked letters to Queeney Thrale, Hester's daughter, Frances Burney to Lady Keith, September – November 1783, *MS Hyde 5*, Houghton Library, Harvard.

> O reflect a little before this fatal answer with which you terrify us is given – *Children – Religion, Friends, Country, Character* – what on earth can compensate the loss of all these?[7]

Doody suggests that Burney's language here is overblown, that 'Hester Thrale had no intention of giving up her Anglican religion, or her English nationality, nor did she desire to cast off her friends or her children.'[8] But Dr Johnson's distaste, and Charles' role – attested later by Hester herself – in creating the breach, places Frances' advice in a different light.[9] As Hester herself later acknowledged, it was Charles who was paramount in preventing his daughter from continuing their friendship, and of describing the religious and national reasons which multiplied the disgust at a widow expressing sexual desire. As Burney would well have understood, widowhood placed Mrs Thrale in an enviable position free from patriarchal oversight of father and husband. That she would not merely consider such a change, but even worse vacillate to the point of damaging her reputation, horrified Frances. As Madame Duval's example demonstrates Burney understood that remarriage could remake a woman's religious and national identity in the eyes of wider society. Hester may well have 'had no intention of giving up her Anglican religion, or her English nationality,' yet religion and nationality were made and remade by one's social position and were not a matter of straightforward and abstract intellectual assent.

A large element of Frances and Queeney's fears therefore revolved around the possibility of Hester living abroad. Writing to Queeney, Frances first commented on Hester's frailty 'how unfit for the new life and dangers she might encounter!' then later that year asserted:

> 'If she marries him, I should wish her not to leave this country […] but indeed it appears to me better than a banishment in her present state of health. The disgrace to <u>you</u> will in nothing be prevented by her living in Italy, - her sufferings, depend upon it, will be <u>dreadful</u>. [10]

[7] Frances Burney to Hester Lynch Thrale, Jan 1783, quoted in Margaret Anne Doody, *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works* (Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1988), 162.
[8] Doody, 162.
[9] Doody 164-5, Chisholm, 176-7.
[10] Frances Burney to Lady Keith, November 22nd 1783, MS Hyde 5, Houghton Library Harvard.

This otherwise puzzling passage refers to contemporary theories of climate and nationality. As Piozzi herself assented in what would be published as her account of a journey to Italy after her marriage, life abroad appeared to risk 'alienation' from their place of birth if they plan to return, or if they remain peripatetic then isolation from society and morality.[11] With an eye to her own family – and perhaps in particular to her step-sister, Frances worries that Hester's marriage to Piozzi and her time in Italy will alienate her from British society. Having already thrown away the freedoms of widowhood, she now risks losing her embeddedness within British society and Protestantism. The breakdown of Frances and Hester's friendship not only shows Frances and Queeney's failure to put pressure on Hester, but also how they were in turn continued to understand the importance of maintaining polite identity. In other words, the lessons of *Evelina* – where female networks are undermined by the implied or explicit threats of Captain Mirvan – are reflected here, with Charles Burney and Samuel Johnson's rhetoric mirrored in Frances' pleas to her friend. This further underscores the scientific and political debates which informed Burney's on British national identity. Once more, we must understand that questions of marriage in Burney's novels and her personal life cannot be understood without their impact on racialised bodies and questions of religion and sovereignty.

With the death of Dr Johnson in 1784, Frances was now at her lowest ebb. Bereft of her old circle, no longer writing, the prospect of marriage disappeared, there was no escape from her father in sight. In their place however a burgeoning friendship with Mary Delany promised a more exalted connection. Mrs Delany had managed to develop from painful shyness in her youth to a socially fluent old age. This was an obvious model for Frances, while Charles typically saw another useful connection. A close friend of the late Duchess of Portland, the King and Queen had granted her a grace and favour apartment alongside a pension of £300 a year, even taking personal charge of decorating her new home. Mrs Delany, to Charles' delight, was eager to secure concrete aid for her new friend. An introduction to the King and Queen soon translated into discrete enquiries about Frances' morals. When the role of Second Keeper of the Robes with a salary of £200 a year appeared however, Frances' reaction was one of surprise and horror. Though the baffled courtier bearing the news offered not to tell her father and take her excuse back to the Queen, Frances knew her father's will was

[11] Hester Lynch Piozzi, *Observations and Reflections Made in the Course of a Journey through France, Italy, and Germany*, Vol II, (London: T. Cadell, 1789), 386-8.

inescapable. Charles certainly understood the honour granted to the family. At court, Frances would not only gain a position for life, but in his view the ear of the Queen.

There were plenty of Burneys who needed preferment. Charles Burney fils, sent down from Cambridge for stealing books to pay gambling debts, had managed to graduate from King's College, Aberdeen. Thanks to his previous misadventures however, he had struggled to find a Bishop to ordain him and was now a schoolmaster and classicist.[12] James Burney, meanwhile, who had circumnavigated the world with Captain Cook and translated for the Tahitian traveller Omai during his years in London, had had his career with the East India Company mysteriously curtailed.[13] Returned 'sick', he nevertheless hoped to escape the boredom of half pay with a promotion.[14] Richard Burney, meanwhile, guilty of some successfully repressed indiscretion, had been expunged from the family and exiled to India.[15] Then there was the ever-present danger of the Meekes and their Jacobite connections. Charles, then, had long feared that his less-than-perfect, cross-confessional and cross-continental family might, together with his own links to Catholic Europe, curtail his chances of preferment. With Frances' offer of a position at court, those worries seemed to be at an end. Just as Frances Burney travelled to the court with 'an agony of mind', so too did her father accompany her to Windsor as if walking his daughter to the altar. The 17th July 1786 marked the beginning of almost five years of servitude.

From the beginning, Frances description of the Royal Family was rich in theatrical metaphor. Wary of Frances' crippling shyness, Mrs Delaney begged her not to hide and to speak fluently when addressed. But as Frances' letter home demonstrates, the entrance of the King and Queen remained a traumatic experience as 'a large man, in deep mourning,' appeared at the drawing room:

[12] Harman, 186.
[13] Ibid. Harman notes Charles blamed his radical politics.
[14] See his letters to the Board of Admiralty in 1806 in which he attempts to explain his conduct, and which reference a first attempt at the same in 1793. The reason for his dismissal seems to be rooted in diverging from orders on a journey to Madras for fear of French ships capturing the fleet.
James Burney to the Board of Admiralty, Apr – May 1806, *Capt.B.548-9*, National Archives.
[15] Exiled at 19 to Bengal, he married Jane Ross and eventually became a schoolmaster. Though he was never entirely reconciled with the family, his children – living in London in the early 1800s – were remembered in Charles Burney's will. Janice Farrar Thaddeus, *Frances Burney: A Literary Life* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), 16-7, 187.

> Oh mercy! thought I, that I were but out of the room! Which way shall I escape? And how pass him unnoticed? […] It seemed to me we were acting a play. There is something so little like common and real life, in everybody's standing, while talking, in a room full of chairs, and standing, too, so aloof from each other, that I almost thought myself upon a stage, assisting in the representation of a tragedy. [16]

As the King peppers her with questions about the process of publishing *Evelina*, Burney's embarrassment only continues as she finds herself reminded of her subaltern status, a quasi-professional woman among the leisured classes; unmarried, no longer publishing, but without a station in life. It is important to recall here that the diaries and letters were drafted and redrafted. Burney's invocation of the theatre 'it seemed to me we were acting […] a tragedy' not only foreshadows her immured misery, but links her textual self with the anxious, spectated bodies of her heroines learning how to navigate the world. Like Evelina, she is cripplingly embarrassed, afraid to be seen, yet conscious of being shepherded by an older woman who introduces her into the scrupulous bodily language expected by the King's gaze. The reference to how 'little like common and real life' the scene was in turn signals a *Cecilia*-like engagement with the fragility of polite spaces. The spectral King 'a ghost' identifiable only through signs 'glitter on the back, a star!' refer the reader back to the Mr Harrel's Jacobite-infused masquerade with its critique of Hanoverian identities. It is this renewed uncertainty and bodily horror which foreshadows court life even as it ties the strangeness of this court life with the fashionable world outside.

Indeed, an account of her appearance at court before she was offered the role of second keeper of the robes reads almost like directions given to an actress. Writing to her sister Esther from Windsor, she replies that 'what you next want is to hear accounts of Kings, Queens, and such Royal Personages. – Oh ho! do you so?' Frances obliges in a long series of 'directions for Coughing, sneezing, or moving before the King and Queen':

> In the first place, you must not cough. If you find a cough tickling in your throat, you must arrest it from making any sound: if you find yourself choaking with the forebearance, you must choak: But not cough. In the 2nd place, you must not sneeze. If you have a vehement Cold, you must take no notice of it: if your nose membranes feel a

[16] Journal Letter to Dr Burney and Susanna Phillips, December 1785, *Journals and Letters*, 211 -229, 211-3.

> great invitation, you must hold your breath; if a sneeze still insists upon making its way, you must oppose it by keeping your teeth grinding together, if the violence of the repulse breaks some blood vessel, you must break the blood vessel: But not sneeze.[17]

Although she has 'many other directions, but no more paper' she cannot answer 'in this little space' and so ends. Such a restriction of textual space anticipates her increasing sense of isolation and imprisonment. Equally important is the fresh focus on the body here as a referent for external ideology. In much the same way that Cecilia grew to understand that a discourse of politeness was an embodied language of replication, so too does Burney here come to depict her own awareness of the bodily language of the court. In other words, just as Evelina and Cecilia must learn how to perform Polite Anglican Womanhood, so too does Burney write back with an almost scientific examination of the bodily pressures of learning to perform court behaviour. It is indeed difficult to read her aside that 'if the violence of the repulse breaks some blood vessel, you must break the blood vessel' not just as a denial of the self that comes with servitude in its causative language, but a hint of the haemorrhage suffered as Mrs Delvile fails to conform herself to the bodily demands of the new regime.

The Queen's choice of Burney reflected her enthusiasm to add to her intellectual circle in much the same way as Richard Cambridge was eager to add the author of *Evelina* to his coterie.[18] Hester Davenport suggests that although *Evelina* and *Cecilia* were approved of at court, 'Fanny was a strange choice [for Keeper of the Robes]' because 'Queen Charlotte had a settled aversion to almost all novels, and something very near it to all novel-writers.'[19] This, however, risks painting a picture of an anti-intellectual court which was far from the truth. Lady Elizabeth Harcourt, with whom the queen forged perhaps her closest extra-familial friendship, noted the monarch's quick intelligence and how:

> She was ferociously well-read, 'well acquainted with the best authors in the English, French, and German languages; and her memory was so retentive, that she never forgot

[17] Frances Burney to Esther Burney, 16 December 1785, *Additional Journals and Letters,* Vol. I. 359 – 361, 361.
[18] As Anne Stott remarks, there was a strong tradition of patronage by the Queen of those from 'lower' stations that was copied by other aristocratic and gentle women. This of course was rife with problems. Stott in particular draws attention to how Hannah More's "discovery" of Ann Yearsley'. See Anne Stott, *Hannah More: The First Victorian* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 72.
[19] Hester Davenport, *Faithful Handmaid: Fanny Burney at the Court of George 3rd* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2000), 253.

> what she once knew.' […] Charlotte referred confidently to the works of Milton, Wycliffe, Cranmer, and Goethe, citing along the way a number of books in German which Burney did not recognise. She was […] never without a book in her hand.[20]

Difficulty inevitably came in the moral associations of novels themselves. Prior to meeting Frances, Charlotte was shocked at the suggestion from Madame de Genlis – at the time popular for her rejection of Rousseau's perceived Atheism [21]- that the 'charmante auteur de Cécile' was like the heroine of a novel.[22] The Queen kindly told Frances that 'she herself would interfere,' with any such future malicious comparisons.[23] Moreover, as Chisholm perceptively notes 'to appoint Mrs Delaney's new young friend would mean that the most talked-about writer in London was now a member of her court.'[24] Frances herself recorded that the Queen intended her to fulfil the role of an informal 'English Reader' and act as a recommender of morally suitable books; under her guidance, her acquaintance Horace Walpole's latest was quickly blacklisted.[25] This does not just speak to the perceived moral quality of the texts, or Frances' ability to hide her cutting social criticism behind a sheen of spotless moral propriety, but rather Queen Charlotte's ability to spot a mind both sharp and perceptive enough to understand the need for scrupulous propriety. Burney's denial that she wrote novels would, of course, have aided this transition as Queen Charlotte built up what can only be described as something akin to a literary and scientific coterie.

Indeed, Queen Charlotte cultivated a model of intellectual and religious curiosity inextricable from a post-Revolutionary virtuousness. Linda Colley identifies Queen Charlotte as part of a 'cult of royal women.'[26] In contrast with George III, painted amongst the relics of a military

---

[20] Janice Hadlow, *The Strangest Family: The Private Lives of George III, Queen Charlotte, and the Hanoverians* (London: William Collins, 2014), 253.
[21] Magdi Wahba, 'Madame De Genlis in England,' *Comparative Literature*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Summer, 1961), 221-238, 223-5.
[22] Simon Macdonald suggests that by 1786 at the latest, Samuel Meeke started to work as an English tutor 'under the auspices of the Mme de Genlis, with notable pupils including Louis-Phillippe d'Orleans, duc de Chartres, the son and heir of the duc d'Orleans.' de Genlis' recommendation, then would have carried a documentary note to it, and the Queen's reassurance – especially in her later advice to Frances (see below) not to respond to a letter from de Genlis – points to an awareness of an unsuitable family connection.
Simon Macdonald, 'Identifying Mrs Meeke: Another Burney Family Novelist' *The Review of English Studies*, 64 (2013), 367 – 385, 380.
[23] Doody, *Frances Burney*, 171; As Magdi Wahba pointed out, part of de Genlis' popularity stemmed from the misapprehension that *Adele et Theodore* was a roman a clef, and that she was as morally pure as her heroine. This in turn points to an uncertain relationship between novels, novel writers, and their characters from which Charlotte was keen to distance her new servant. Wahba, 'Madame de Genlis' 235.
[24] Chisholm, *Fanny Burney*, 132.
[25] Hadlow, *The Strangest Family*, *25*.
[26] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707 – 1837* (London: Vintage, 1996), 284-5.

life, Benjamin West represented her holding books on childcare or surrounded by her daughters, something that 'exalted her position in the Royal Family even as it confined it' and thus would have required 'royal approval.' Such 'feminisation' offered 'women who had been worn out by repeated childbirths' royal recognition in an idealised form.[27] In the best Georgian tradition, this was often satirised: Colley cites Gilray's print of the royal couple 'parsimoniously eating boiled eggs in front of the fire.'[28] Colley nevertheless argued that such a 'cult' served a parallel purpose to the veneration of the Virgin in Catholic countries. In other words, a model version of womanhood for all good Anglican women to venerate and embody. Charlotte's cultivation of a scrupulous femininity therefore mirrored Burney's heroines attempts to find freedom within conservative gender roles. As Janice Hadlow surmises, 'Charlotte would probably have chosen to satisfy her intellectual needs rather as the Duchess of Portland had done at Bulstrode.'[29] Unable 'to retire from public duties,' however she nevertheless used the agency granted by ageing motherhood to gather together a scientific and cultural coterie at court. Jean Andre du Luc, the reader to the Queen 'was a geologist of European repute, whose task was to keep [her] fully abreast of new developments in science', while Elizabeth de la Fit and Rev. Charles de Guiffardiere were the Queen's readers in German and French respectively.[30] *The Ladies Poetical Magazine* claimed that 'Happy for England, were each female mind / to science more, and less to pomp inclined.'[31] The whole poem at first appears to echo Colley's rather bland representation of virtuous domesticity. Each parent should ensure their girls have 'female minds' like the queen, who passes on the 'flame of virtue.' Yet the poem also suggests that 'female mind[s]' are not intrinsically gendered and thereby limited but can rather be steered by their parents to suitable 'inclinations.' In other words, the poet suggests that the Queen teaches that the realm of acceptable pursuits for women is not just domestic frippery but is instead open to any intellectual sphere that can be seen to 'polish life.[32]' Gender difference, in other words, is just

[27] Colley, *Britons,* 284.
[28] Colley, *Britons*, 248.
[29] Hadlow, *The Strangest Family*, 254-5.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Quoted in Clarissa Campbell Orr. 'Queen Charlotte: Scientific Queen' in Clarissa Campbell Orr, ed, *Queenship in Britain, 1660 – 1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), 236 – 66, 236, 255.
[32] The Royal couple's interest in their children, Flora Fraser notes, was unusual; Charlotte gave thorough instruction in botany – Which Clarissa Campbell Orr remarks was a field newly considered suitable for women – linguistics, physics, engineering, and even a clamber through Whitbread's brewery at Southwark. Herschel's pension, meanwhile, was dependent on the occasional demonstration of his telescope to the entire family. This came alongside more traditional drawing lessons, which were given a scientific tinge by Joseph Banks' instruction.
Flora Fraser, *Princesses: The Six Daughters of George III* (London: John Fraser, 2005), 21, 98;

a matter of social conditioning. Evidence of the exact nature of Charlotte's personal beliefs are scarce. Yet there are hints – such as a letter to her brother in 1779 in which she denied the intellectual weakness of women - that she held views at times more radical than that of the Bluestockings.[33] Whatever the extent of these beliefs, she nevertheless sought to create a platonic ideal of Anglican womanhood, where virtue and learning were balanced.

Queen Charlotte's religious beliefs held an unsurprisingly ecumenical tinge. Shortly before Frances' arrival at court, she records a conversation between herself, Mrs Delaney and the Queen. Frances records with amazement as the Queen discussed not only Goethe, De Genlis, and Klopstock, but:

> Went on discussing Milton. This led to Wickliffe, & Cranmer; and she spoke of the Roman Catholic superstitions, - "O, so odd! Can it signify to God almighty if I eat a piece of fish or a piece of meat? – And, one of the Queen of France's sisters wears the heel of her shoe before! – For a penance; - As if God Almighty could care for that!"
> "It is supposing in Him the caprice of a fine lady."
> 'Yes, just so. Yet it is amasing [sic], and pretty too, [xxxxx *1 word]* – how sincere the lower people are, of the Catholics. I was with my mother at ___, a Catholic town, and there was a lady we knew, had a very bad tooth-ache; she suffered night and day, and we were very sorry: But over the river there was a Virgin Mary of great fame for miracles, and, one morning, when I wanted to get up, our maid did not come – and nobody knew where she was – and she could not be found: - At last she came back with a large bouquet which she had carried over the river in the night and got it blessed, and gave it to the lady to cure her tooth-ache.[34]

This is not the account of a rabid anti-Catholic. Catholicism here is a series of curious eccentricities among the particularly devout Christians, an object of curiosity out of which elements might be appropriated. After discussing her experience as the secular canon of a Lutheran Abbey in Westphalia, Charlotte recounts how as a girl she was so curious about

---

Campbell-Orr, 'Queen Charlotte', 236-7;
Hadlow, *Strangest Family*, 262;
Frances Burney to Susanna Burney Phillips, Before 24th August, 1786, in Peter Sabor, ed, *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, Vol. 1, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011), 150 – 151, 151; ibid, n.480, 481.

[33] Queen Charlotte to Prince Charles, 6 July 1779, Landeshauptarchiv Schwerin, quoted in Hadlow, 255.

[34] Journal Entry, December 18th 1785, Stewart Cooke, ed, *The Additional Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, Vol 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 347 – 59, 357 – 9.

Catholicism that her mother allowed her to go to the chapel in the Catholic town.[35] Promising 'I would go if I would be sure not to laugh,' she kept her eyes 'half shut, half open' so as not to catch sight of something risible. '[B]ut there was nothing ridiculous,' until she admitted her identity to a curious parishioner, replied 'Yes, Sir' to his statement that 'You are then Heretics' and was promptly chased out with a broom.[36] Burney depicts a personal toleration and understanding of those of a different denomination in a monarch who nevertheless understood the political necessity of Anglicanism to their public identity. Charlotte can serve as a secular abbess of a Lutheran Abbey, visit Catholic churches out of sheer curiosity, and come to the conclusion that Catholic belief is finicky, with a theology akin to 'the caprice of a fine lady' that reveals the conflation of gender and Christian confession. Yet this suggests in turn Charlotte found elite Anglican identity ridiculously affected. Charlotte's role as a cornerstone of Anglican Womanhood paradoxically undermines it, with her own shift from Lutheranism to Anglicanism foreshadowing the possibility of her children's shifting confessions in the marriage market, and the ultimate contingency of elite identity.[37]

In this context, then, it is worth exploring in more detail Charlotte's own account of her early history as the secular canon of a Lutheran abbey in Westphalia:

> But we have Protestant nunneries in Germany; - I belonged to one which was under the Imperial protection. There is one for royal families – one for noblesse: - The candidates' coats of arms are put up several weeks to be examined, and if any flaw is found, they are not elected. These nunneries are intended for young ladies of little fortune and high birth. There is great licence in them – they have Balls: - not at home, but next door: - and there is no restriction but to go to prayers at eight, at nine, and at night. That is *very little, you know*, - and wear black, or white. [38]

---

[35] Ibid.
[36] Ibid.
[37] For the confessional flexibility in the royal marriage market, see: John L. Bullion, '"George be a King!" The relationship between Princess Augusta and George III' in Stephen Taylor, Richard Connors, and Clyve Jones, eds., *Hanoverian Britain and Empire: Essays in Memory of Phillip Lawson* (London: Boydel and Brewer, 1998), 177 – 79, 189n;
Queen Charlotte to the Prince of Wales, 12 August 1770, Arthur Aspinall, ed. *The Correspondence of George, Prince of Wales,* Vol 1. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963);
Andrew C. Thompson, *George II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 107;
Hannah Smith, 'The Idea of a Protestant Monarchy in Britain, 1714 – 1760,*' Past and Present,* No. 185 (Nov. 2004), 91 – 118, 102-4.
[38] Journal Entry, December 18th 1785, Stewart Cooke, ed, *The Additional Journals and Letters of Frances Burney,* Vol 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 347 – 59, 358.

Frances replied that 'how glad we all were, that she was no nun,' to which Charlotte replies with repetitions of her interest in, and sympathy for, the local Catholics. Yet despite Frances' gladness, it is evident here that Charlotte has hardly given up her role as a secular canon. She has merely exchanged it. As she describes life in Westphalia she simultaneously elucidates the history of Frances' entrance into court and sets out the schema for her life, a lesson repeated and indeed emphasised by Mr Smelt. She too was subject to a long moral investigation. When Frances wavered at the official invitation, she was reminded that hers was an offer sought by, and usually offered to, those of much higher birth.[39] She must think of her father's lack of money and inability to support a spinster whose chances of marriage were now almost non-existent.[40] And, to her mortification, she was also offered a dress in her first months at court.[41] Most importantly, 'private enquiries proved her irreproachable in chastity and discreet conduct.'[42] Charlotte, then, saw the monastic metaphor for court life not as restrictive, but as an alternate model of social womanhood and community which afforded one intellectual and limited other freedoms at the expense of bodily autonomy in an uncertain world. For Burney however, as for many of her contemporaries, the prospect of some degree of female autonomy – as evinced in the idea of protestant convent in England or Mr Delvile's cousin escaping marriage by fleeing to a convent still held, at best, profoundly ambivalent associations in a culture where religious violence still threatened to erupt.

The question of Protestant communities was the subject of increasing discussion through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. A century after the dissolution of the monasteries in the late 1530s, 'many members of the gentry who were far from being Catholics' began to lament the lack of alternative to marriage for their daughters, or even began to lament the dissolution as 'closing one possible opening – even a successful career – for single women.'[43] Bridget Hill points particularly to the melded families at a 'large ruinous mansion' at Little Gidding, where the extended female relations of Mrs Farrar 'formed an almost separate

[39] Doody, 172.
[40] Harman, 204; Janice Farrar Thaddeus, *Frances Burney: A Literary life*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), 98.
[41] Frances was loath to accept it, mostly due to the 'grossness of the manner of the messenger,' a profoundly jealous Mrs Schwellenberg. It was this gift, she suggests, which 'raise[d] in me my first spirit of resistance. Journal, 8th August 1786, *Court Journals and Letters*, vol. i..82 – 6, 83 – 4.
[42] Doody, 169.
[43] Bridget Hill, 'A Refuge from Men: The Idea of a Protestant Nunnery', *Past and Present*, No. 117 (Nov., 1987), 107 – 130, 109-110.

society' combining charity, education, and 'reading, particularly of history.'[44] Such questions intensified as the century continued. Mary Astell's *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies* of 1694:

> Contained a unique proposal: namely, for single women to join together by living in community; a sort of intellectual convent where ladies who chose not to marry could live lives of personal piety and holiness. The idea received contemporary attention with many – such as Daniel Defoe and Samuel Richardson – approving the idea; while others […] related the Protestant objection that such a community was too much like Roman Catholic monasticism. [45]

Hester Thrale and Lady Montagu also lamented the lack of a viable alternative to marriage and the benefits of monasticism.[46] Indeed, the outright abolition of the monasteries, Samuel Wesley lamented in the 1720s, was regrettable. They could and should have been reformed to provide a communal, sex-segregated space of prayer and study without the whole-life commitment required under Catholicism.[47] With the process of offering Burney a place at court so closely modelling Queen Charlotte's account of joining the Lutheran Abbey, and considering her wide reading and attempts to create an enlightened and virtuous model of Anglican Womanhood around her at court, the Queen was clearly influenced by the possibilities of rehabilitating these communities. While it cannot be said straightforwardly that Charlotte was attempting to create a monastery for Burney and other women like her who were unmarried and potentially unmarriageable, such spaces clearly went beyond the salons of Montagu or Thrale. As Burney would have recognised, Protestant convents were attempts to come to terms with the ruins of the monasteries which peppered the landscape must be seen as inextricable from Hanoverian attempts to come to terms with the legacy of the Reformation and the Revolutions of the 17th century. It was no accident, in other words, that Wesley wrote 5 years after the first Jacobite rising, or Mary Astell in the wake of 1688, times at which the presence of the ruined monasteries would have proved particularly troubling for those who sought to dismiss Stuart and Catholic claims.

---

[44] Hill, 'A Refuge from Men', 110-1.
[45] Robert M. Andrews, 'Women of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century High Church Tradition: a Biographical and Historiographical Exploration of a Forgotten Phenomenon in Anglican History', *Anglican and Episcopal History,* Vol. 84, No. 1 (March 2015), 49 – 64, 58-9.
[46] Hill, 'A Refuge from Men', 120; Caroline Franklin, 'A Land of Slavery and Superstition'? Hester Thrale and Elizabeth Montagu in France', *Modern Language Review*, Vol. 114, No. 2 (April 2019), 212 – 229, 221.
[47] Samuel Wesley, *A Letter Concerning the Religious Societies* (London, 1724), 37-8, quoted in Hill, 'A Refuge from Men, 120-1.

Yet Burney found the pressures of such a structured life unbearable. In late July of 1786, she gave an account to Susanna '*of the general method of passing the Day*; that then I may only write what varies[.]' Her regime was strict:

> I rise at six o'clock. Dress in a morning gown & cap & wait my first summons; which is at all times from 7 to near 8; but commonly in the exact half hour between them. […] By 8 o'clock, or a little after, for she is extremely expeditious, she is dressed. She then goes out, to join the King, & to be joined by the Princesses, & they all proceed to the King's Chapel in the Castle, to Prayers […] I then return to my own room, to Breakfast.[48]

Further interruptions came at 9 o'clock, when she 'ma[d]e a serious and steady examination of every thing I have upon my Hands in the way of business', 12:45 'time for the Queen to begin dressing', then dinner at five before her last summons at 'between Eleven and 12.' Yet there was a further tyranny:

> My summons, upon all regular occasions, that is, morning, Noon, and Night toilettes, is neither more nor less than a *Bell*. Upon extra-occasions, a Page is commonly sent. At first, I felt inexpressibly discomforted by this mode of Call; a *Bell!* – it seemed so mortifying a mark of servitude, I always felt myself blush, though alone, with conscious shame at my own strange degradation, - but I have philosophised myself now into some reconcilement with this manner of summons.[49]

The bell that summons her to service dangerously summons the cloistered to prayer. Yet in comparison to the freedom from the marriage market promised by Astell, or that Mortimer Delvile's cousin finds in the prospect of a convent, Burney suggests that performing court identity a constant agony. Harman and Doody suggest that her friendship with the Queen overcame any deeper rebellion.[50] Yet this is not quite correct: Burney's constant pleas to

[48] Journal entry, 24th July 1786, Court Journals and Letters, Vol. I. 33 – 38, 33 – 34.
[49] Ibid, 38.
[50] Harman, 204 – 8; Doody, 175.

herself to stoically endure her situation highlights the agonies of handing over control of her body to her Royal Mistress. There cannot, Burney understands, be freedom of thought without freedom of the body. There are, in her entries, an argument that permitting a degree of intellectual freedom only to deny its expression is crueller even than ontological tyranny. Every ring of the bell signals her 'strange degradation', reminding her of her 'servility' under a new hierarchy of female bodies. But such a synecdoche - the bell and routine thereby describing Burney's relationship to the Queen - necessarily provides a way in which Burney can criticise her new relationship without either representing or indeed articulating her criticism thereof, and therefore her Court Diaries' accounts of her bodily strain can be read as an extended critique of Charlotte's version of Anglican Womanhood and the monarchy itself.

Burney therefore failed to find freedom in such a 'Lutheran Abbey' under her 'secular abbess.' References to convents unsurprisingly predominate in Burney's accounts of life at Windsor and Kew. Writing in her journal for January 1787, several months after being immured, and recovering from an illness, Burney 'resolved to be *Happy':*

> To be patient […] to settle myself in my monastery, without one idea of ever quitting it; - to study for the approbation of my lady abbess, & make it a principal source of content , as well as spring of action; - & to associate more chearily [sic] with my surrounding Nuns and Monks, - these were the articles which were to support my resolution. I thank god I can tell my dearest friends I have observed them all. […] This little history of my *Reformation* shall end this partie.[51]

Read in the context of Queen Charlotte's plans for female community, these references to her 'lady abbess' and her fellow 'Nuns and Monks' and of 'my Reformation' lose their sense of irony and instead mark the realities and failures of Queen Charlotte's project. Burney's lamentation of her 'two disappointments now no longer recent' point to George Owen Cambridge's failure to either propose and Mrs Thrale's severance of their friendship. But it is not just Burney who has failed, rather than escaped from, the marriage market. The Princesses were increasingly unhappy as the prospect of marriage receded. As Hadlow suggests, George's failure to find suitable matches for his daughters 'was a significant

[51] Journal Tuesday 16th January 1787, Stewart Cooke, ed. *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney,* Vol. II. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 24-5, 25.

dereliction of paternal duty.'[52] As a result, they were trapped 'in an ever-extended girlhood which could not satisfy [them]' and indeed only led them to ever greater frustration.[53] Unlike their mother, Colley writes, 'none of her daughters made a similar impact on the public, mewed up as they were in Windsor Castle like nuns.'[54] This was language that the princesses themselves used, especially as the century drew to a close and the prospect of a marriage for which they had been educated receded.[55] The shared frustrated sexual desire, of the failure of both Charles Burney and the King to find matches for their daughters, should not therefore obscure the potential role of Queen Charlotte in summoning Burney and refusing to countenance the thought of sending her children away. This was no voluntary community of Protestant women. The Queen took her role as Abbess-Monarch over her charges more than seriously. Everybody, it seemed, was trapped.

Indeed, the Queen demanded to know every corner of Frances' mind. By the time Frances joined the court family, 'the family now had three homes in London, Kew, and Windsor, the journey 'undertaken with great regularity and with striking speed.'[56] On one of these trips Frances found herself alone with M. de Guiffardiere who subjected her to an 'inquisition' on 'the subjects […] I least wish to discuss with him, Religion and Morality.'[57] After Frances defends M. de Genlis, Guiffardiere turns to religion. Yet for Frances:

> There is no topic in the world upon which I am so careful how I speak […] with earnestness. Mischief, here, is so easily done, so difficultly reformed. I have made it, therefore, a rule through my life, never to talk in details about religious opinions, but with those of whose principles I have the fullest conviction and highest respect. It is therefore very, very rarely, I have ever entered upon the subject, but with female friends or acquaintances, whose hearts I have well known, & who would be as unlikely to give as to receive any perplexity from the discourse. But, with regard to men, I have known none with whom I have, willingly, conferred upon them, except Dr Johnson, Mr Lock, and & Mr Smelt. - & - one more – with whom, now, - these lips will never again hold converse.[58]

[52] Hadlow, *Strangest Family*, 346.
[53] Hadlow, *Strangest Family*, 337-8.
[54] Colley, *Britons*, 283.
[55] Hadlow, *Strangest Family*, 549.
[56] Hadlow, *Strangest Family*, 220.
[57] Frances Burney, Saturday 20th January 1787, Journal entry, *Court Journals*, Vol ii. 36 – 44, 37.
[58] Ibid, 39.

The claustrophobia of this scene echoes Sir Clement's interrogation of Evelina, whose confessional loyalties are tested with the threat of sexual violence. We have already discussed Johnson's Catholic and Jacobite sympathies; but the implied inclusion of Cambridge underscores the vigilance which she seeks a community where her heterodox religious views will not 'receive any perplexity.' Indeed, the 'female friends or acquaintances' suggests a maternal religious inheritance that harks back to her beloved Catholic grandmother. But this passage also points to the tension between Anglican Womanhood's patriarchal orthodoxy and the existence of private sympathies and loyalties. Guiffardiere indeed acts as a member of the inquisition: At first he takes her silence as kindling for 'grave suspicions' that she was a 'mere philosopher' and 'incredulous with regard to all revealed religion.' When even this provocation does not prompt engagement, he prods further and entreats her to 'sift [her] opinions' and because she was 'afraid of him' she 'beg[s] to decline' only for him to ask whether she is 'a Catholic' - something she strongly denies.[59] When they reach their destination however, Queen Charlotte asks whether Guiffardiere talked or read to her. She demurs, but the queen demands vigorous agreement, 'nobody has more general knowledge, not a more pleasing & easy way of communicating it.' Frances again retreats, only for the Queen to press on making his 'panegyric […] and seemed quite disappointed at the coldness of my concurrence.'[60] This suggests perhaps that even if the Queen did not personally arrange Guiffardiere and Burney's isolation in the carriage in order for the former to interrogate the latter, then she remains obsessed with the personal beliefs of Frances the orthodoxy of which she had perhaps been given reason to doubt. Whatever the truth of the arrangement, it nevertheless points to Frances' deeply unsettling experience of the depths of control and authority the Queen claimed here. In turn, it would have only underscored for Frances the necessity of an ever-deeper performance of scrupulous loyalty, and the court as a space even more rigorous than those in the polite world.

Queen Charlotte moreover was equally obsessed with Frances' enduring chastity. On the evening of Saturday the 20th, Frances asks the Queen for a meeting to clarify the rules of 'my visits and acquaintance.'[61] This was granted the next day. Frances explains that her 'acquaintance, hither to, […] was not only very numerous, but very mixed, taking in not only

[59] Ibid, 40.
[60] Ibid, 41.
[61] Ibid, 44.

most stations in life, but also most parties.'[62] In other words, Frances was used to an expansive acquaintance from differing classes and political factions, thanks in part to her father's work and, lately, her own fame. Charlotte replies in a 'liberal, & open minded' manner with 'the most open opinions […] in relation to parties and their consequences.' In future, Charlotte instructs Frances to refer to Mr Smelt's guidance, which she then recounts in the entry for the next day.

> That I should see nobody at all, - but by appointment. […]
> That I should see no fresh person whatsoever without an intermediate permission from the Queen: nor any party, even amongst those already authorised, without appraising her of such a plan.
> […]
> "And, with respect to your parties, - such as you may occasionally have here – you have but one rule for keeping all things smooth, & all partizans unoffended, at a distance, - which is, - to have *no men! none!*'[63]

The following passage was heavily edited by Burney in the final years of her life. Yet important features remain. She 'was silent' as she had 'seen by his looks and manner particular thoughts, particular objects were in his head.' Both are thinking of 'Mr Cambridge, Sir [who] I cannot exclude!' [64] For Burney, then, the monastery-court required not just social but sexual privation; a whole and unwilling commitment to chaste womanhood under Queen Charlotte. Unlike Astell or Wesley's conceptions, there is nothing voluntary in this court life and it is no surprise that Frances herself writes to Susan that 'I am married […] the knot is tied.'[65] As Doody perceives, Burney's 'entrance into court life continued to seem like a wretched enforced marriage, or […] like entering a convent and taking a veil.'[66] Burney's vows were not just to the Anglican god-through-the-family, but carried out in service to her 'abbess' the queen. But in an act of foreshadowing of the trauma ahead, she wrote that she was 'bound to this duty,' and pledged 'to strain every nerve to succeed.'[67] Under such strain, they would nearly break.

---

[62] Sunday, 21st January 1787, *Court Journals and Letters,* Vol. ii. 44 – 6, 45.
[63] Monday, 22nd January, 1787, *Court Journals and Letters*, Vol. ii, 46 – 47.
[64] Ibid, 47.
[65] Frances Burney to Susanna Burney Phillips, 17 July 1786, *Court Journals and Letters,* Vol. i. 2 – 17, 8.
[66] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 173.
[67] Ibid.

Juliana Schwellenberg had arrived in England from Germany with Queen Charlotte. 'One of the Queen's assistant dressers,' she did little 'actual dressing herself,' and was a prime target for the satirists, who picked up on her days spent quarrelling with the other servants.[68] Mrs Schwellenberg was capable of physical violence. In November 1787, Burney writes in her journal that she 'had a terrible journey indeed to town' with Mrs Schwellenberg, who refused to draw up the carriage windows. The next day, Burney was terrified to hear that the other servants thought she would go the way of her predecessor, whose winter journeys and quarrels with Mrs Schwellenberg led to her near blindness and breakdown. [69] The focus on her eyes here is critical. Both Schwellenberg and the Queen's demands impede their subordinates' ability to see, and consequently force her to perform an identity which they simultaneously deny its full expression. Such a self-denial is not only traumatic but, as Mrs Delvile understands, wounding. But Frances's reference to her predecessor also locates her suffering in a genealogy and hierarchy of court servitude, mapping the physical effects that her superior's carelessness has upon her body. Just as she represented the foreign Germanness of both monarchs to political cartoonists, as Doody points out, so too does attacking her elderly foreign womanhood present a way for Burney to express her hatred of life at court. But like her invocations of bells, nuns, and convents, Burney also draws attentions to the similarities between the court and the worst excesses of the supposedly foreign and tyrannical Catholics they had replaced. While the Glorious Revolution may have caused a great disjunction in Royal history, the genealogy of suffering has continued with little interruption.

The possibility of an escape home however only underscores the parallels between the court and the world outside. Soon after her carriage journey,

> My dear Father spent the Evening with me, & was so incensed at the state of my Eyes, which were now as piteous to behold as to feel, & at the relation of their usage, that he charged me, another time, to draw up my glass in defiance of all opposition, & to abide by all consequences, since my place was wholly immaterial when put in competition with my Health. I was truly glad of this permission to rebel; & it has given me an internal hardiness in all similar assaults, that has at least relieved my mind from the

[68] Hadlow, *Strangest Family*, 177, 323; Doody, 175.
[69] Tuesday, 27th November 1787, *Court Journals and Letters*, Vol. ii. 290 – 294, 290-1; Doody, 176.

> terror of giving mortal offence. [Yet, she later decides] I must cherish no *thought of retreat*, unless – *called* hence, by willing kindness, to the paternal home – or *driven* hence, by weakness & illness, from the fatigues of my office. [70]

Given 'permission to rebel' by her father, and since her 'place was wholly immaterial [compared] with [her] health' she relishes the possibility of escape only to realise she is still trapped. She cannot choose to leave but must be 'called' home by her father's judgement of her suffering, or 'driven' there by the suffering of court life in a passage. Just as the monastic bell shaped the contours of her day at court, so too does the Queen's commands or father's voice shape the future. The 'state of my eyes' and 'relation of their usage' is not just a synecdoche for her suffering at court then, but points to a deeper conflation between the demands of court and polite identity that prevent any true possibility of an escape. Travelling back to Windsor with Mrs Schwellenberg, she contemplates her father's 'disappointment' and her step-mother's 'reproach' should she return home. Such 'reflections powerfully forbid the rebellion' and she '*accepted a bit of cake* which she suddenly offered me as we reached Windsor, & […] submitted to my monastic destiny.'[71] The Queen, Mrs Schwellenberg, her stepmother Elizabeth Allen, are all here conflated under the spectre of 'the eternal reproach from mother'. Submitting to her father and these women 'monastic destiny' is to take communion 'a bit of cake' with her fellow religieuse. But it is also a rejection of the freedoms such female communities promised, as court, family, and polite identity are all elided under the Anglican church.

The Royal family's complicated relationship with surveillance and performance can be seen at their home at Kew. At first glance, the more relaxed schedule at Kew represented a relief from the formalities of Windsor. Yet once the family made Kew a regular haunt, they attracted 'large numbers of genteel sightseers':

> Mrs Papendiek remembered Kew Green 'covered with carriages, more than £300 being often taken on the bridge on Sundays.' One of the major attractions for such prosperous visitors was the chance to catch a glimpse of their rulers. 'Their majesties were to be

[70] 27th November 1787, 290, 293
[71] Ibid, 292.

> seen at the windows, speaking to their friends and the royal children amusing themselves in their own gardens.[‘][72]

Though Hadlow claims Frances considered Kew relatively private then, such privacy is relative to a family whose sovereignty is always rooted in the public display of their domestic virtue. In the journal, Frances qualifies and defines the family’s ‘retired’ state as living ‘as the simplest Country Gentlefolks,’ that is ‘the King has not even an Equerry with him, nor the King any lady to attend her when she goes her airings [sic].’[73] ‘The Kew life,’ Frances noted, ‘is very different from Windsor’ in terms of its schedule and dress. There were no early prayers, and so the Queen rises later, ‘her dress is plain, & the hour for the second Toilette extremely uncertain.’ Thinking of ‘the Kew life’ as private, then, obscures the extent to which Frances understood it to be merely a different form of performance. The irregularity of their conduct meant that there was even less certainty about when a particular behaviour was appropriate. The family ran about ‘without precaution or care’; yet not only did this mean ‘there is a greater danger of encountering some of the royal family’ but that ‘it is a still greater difficulty to see company here than at Windsor.’ Burney could no longer withdraw to her room or indeed rest briefly in an empty space because she could no longer be certain when and where the King or Queen might be watching. Worse, the King and Queen themselves were being watched as the public were eager to see proved the family’s virtuous domesticity and, with this enlightened moderation, proof that they were different from their predecessors.

The need for the King to be seen to demonstrate his virtuosity among a crowd of polite subjects carried with it the constant risk of violence. On Wednesday 2nd August 1786, shortly after she noted how the Princess Royal ‘writes German with as much facility as I do English’ Frances had headed to her room for her cloak to find:

> Madame La Fîte just waiting for me. […] an attempt had been made upon the life of the King! – I was almost petrified with horror at the intelligence. If This King is not safe, - good, pious, beneficent as he is, - if His life is in danger, from his own subjects, of violence, , - What is to guard the throne, & which way is a monarch to be secure?[74]

[72] Hadlow, 217.
[73] July 28 1786, *CJL*, Vol. 1., 52, 52.
[74] 2nd August 1786, CJL, vol. 1.57 – 67, 59 – 61.

Clarifying that as 'you may have heard it wrong, I will tell it right,' Burney explains how the King's carriage had 'just stopt at the Garden Door, at St James' when 'a decently dressed woman' attempted to stab him. The king was unharmed, and the woman was later declared insane. Frances goes on to marvel at the King's fortitude and cheerfulness compared to the rest of his family and staff, and far from ordering a lockdown of the city 'insisted upon walking on the terrace, with no other attendant than his single equerry. The poor Queen went with him, pale and silent.' Both Frances and the King understand that a key component of his power is rooted in, yet made vulnerable by, his visibility: George must be seen, in other words, in order to retain authority and trust. Yet this proximity to his people, whether in the carriage or walking on the terrace, only highlights how he embodies and performs a kingship which is as powerful as it is fragile. Here, for example, the putative threat to the King's body causes an emotional and physiological echo in the derangement of a court routine which has itself caused unspeakable violence to its courtiers. Frances articulates the absurdity: if the rigours of life at court reduce its actors to scourged automatons, any quasi-treasonous question - 'if This King is not safe' - of a replacement or alternative remains troublingly unthinkable, especially now any Jacobite alternative has vanished.

The uneasy presence of popular violence and royal legitimacy is further evident in the King's concern for his would-be assassin's safety. The 'decently dressed' woman

> Approached him with a petition. It was rolled up, & had the usual superscription *For the King's most excellent Majesty.* She presented it with her right hand, & - at the same moment that the King bent forward to take it, she drew from it, with her left hand, a knife with which she aimed straight at his Heart!
> […]
> While the Guards & his own people now surrounded the King, the Assassin was seized by the populace, who were tearing her away, no doubt to fall the instant sacrifice of her murtherous purpose, when the King, the only calm and moderate person then present, called aloud to the Mob The poor creature is mad! – do not hurt her! She has not hurt me!"[75]

[75] Ibid.

Despite Frances' determination to 'consciously tell it right,' we must recall again that these diaries remain highly stylised texts. They record events not – or not solely - as objective eyewitness accounts, but instead form part of her wider political theory. Her desire to 'tell it right,' then, must be seen as an attempt to reconcile the events to a coherent political context. With this in mind, the metaphors of this apparently pro-Hanoverian scene are striking in a complex and Humean scepticism of constitutional monarchy. The assassin's knife, after all, is concealed in a petition: expressions of popular will and therefore the uneasy relationship between the post-Revolutionary sovereign and the crowd always carries a frisson of popular violence. [76] Moreover, the mob's attack on the woman, the carriage, and the presence of the petition echoes the Gordon Riots, where – in part – the rejection of a popular petition spurred attacks on MPs carriages and a week of insurrection. Indeed, in having the King act as a calming presence on the mob's worst impulses she radically negates the possibility of the masses having any political legitimacy whatsoever. It is only in the 'calm and moderate person' of the King, and his ability to delineate the boundaries of madness and thereby authorise or proscribe violence, that can avoid the base impulses and dispense true justice.

The problem, of course, is that while Burney may view the King as de facto and even de jure sovereign the means by which he consolidates his legitimacy are still troubling when compared to erstwhile certainties of the great chain of being. As the tacit questions of royal legitimacy in this passage suggest then , Burney views the question of post-1688 legitimacy as radically uncertain.

> The next morning, August 3rd the poor Queen looked so ill that it was easy to see how miserable had been her night. It is unfortunately the unalterable opinion of Mrs Schwellenberg that some latent conspiracy belongs to this attempt, & that therefore it will never rest here. This dreadful suggestion preys upon the mind of the Queen , though she struggles to conquer or conceal it. I longed […] to speak upon the matter, & combat the opinion, but as she still said nothing, it was not possible.[77]

The fear, in other words, is that the assassin was part of a wider Jacobite conspiracy to restore the Stuart dynasty. This fear, though quickly proved false, nevertheless reveals the extent to

[76] See: David Hume, 'Of The Protestant Succession,' *Political Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 213-5.
[77] Ibid.

which dynastic concerns of legitimacy and security continued to plague both Burney and the royal family as late as the mid 1780s. Despite Burney's obvious and deeply-felt sympathy for the King and Queen, her own thoughts on legitimacy are clearly more complex. The Hanoverians' legitimacy in some part rested on a degree of popular sovereignty; i.e that the sovereign's power came from proof of their moderation rather than divine right. Burney however rejects any conception of a popular sovereignty as illegitimate. Petitions carry force less because they represent a legitimate democratic desire, and more because they carry with them the implicit threat of another insurrection. This is unthinkable. Yet George's authority clearly stems from his ability to be seen by, and reassure, the crowd; his is a calming and authoritative presence which is vested seemingly in a body which underwrites his authority to act as law-giver. The crowd, then, does not have the right to choose the king, but the King's power both extends to an authoritarian right to institute a repressive state of emergency over the urban landscape *yet* depends on his instead choosing to call for restraint and reassure the crowd of his visibility. In short, Burney cannot follow the logic which led to the overthrow of the Stuarts, yet the horror at the violence exercised by the Hanoverian regime as it consolidates its legitimacy on unwilling bodies pales when she thinks of the popular violence its failure would cause.

These contradictions are critical to understanding the link between virtue, sovereignty, and empire in the Hastings Crisis. For Jeremy Black, George's interest in Indian affairs were greater than his predecessor, thanks in part both to the increase in governmental oversight of the company, but also due to 'the legacy of the political crisis of 1783 – 4':

> New-found controversy over the character of British rule was also significant. This focussed on the impeachment, on charges of corruption, of Warren Hastings, the former governor-general of Bengal, a step George privately deplored, although he had been keen to see him resign. [The increase in governmental oversight] was not followed by any increase in royal oversight or intervention. The contrary, instead, was the case. […] To George, good government in India was linked to security, and this lent a prudential dimension to the proper use of authority. He had hoped that Pitt's Act might "lay a foundation for by degrees correcting those shocking enormities in India that disgrace

human nature and if not put a stop to threaten the expulsion of the company out of that wealthy region."[78]

In considering the personal morality of British Rulers in India as critical to the nature of state power, George centres implicitly white male and Anglican bodies as the centre of imperial power.[79] That is, personal morality is important not – or not just - because it is a personal good, but rather because Christian morality legitimates Hanoverian rule and concurrently British Imperialism on the Indian subcontinent. This is invariably strongly linked to pre-industrial capitalism, as Hastings' errors 'threatened the expulsion of the company out of that wealthy region.' This again illuminates the link between sociability, religion, and consumption in the late Hanoverian state, as Hasting's social and moral bankruptcy threatening to bring down the East India Company and, with it, Britain's claims over India.

Yet eliding sovereignty and morality in the person of the King was evidence for some contemporaries of George's inheritance of the worst Stuart traits. George III's hatred of corruption came partly from Lord Bute. The strength of the connection between Bute and George in the latter's youth is well attested, beginning with Horace Walpole's typically acerbic view of Stuart tyranny in George's putative favouritism towards his beloved tutor. Lord Bute was a well-connected Scottish aristocrat who, spending most of his life in England, found favour with the Frederick, Prince of Wales, and was 'quietly' (to the point that nobody, not George II, least of his current tutor Waldegrave, realised what was going on

[78] Jeremy Black, *George III: America's Last King* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006, 2008), 335.

[79] Frances Burney's record of Warren Hastings' trial is too extensive to go into detail here. Nevertheless, she draws on the theatrical language of spectacle to record her distaste for Burke as prosecutor and sympathy for Hastings, despite her friendship with the former. This in turn suggests that this account forms part of her wider political project in which she portrays a quasi-ridiculous Burke as part of the wider imposition of moral and imperial patriarchal identity on India in the wake of the American Revolution, an attempt which could not be excused by Hastings' moral failings. See:
P.J Marshall, *The Impeachment of Warren Hastings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 20;
Julie Murray, 'Company Rules: Burke, Hastings, and the Spectre of the Modern Liberal State,' *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 41. No. 1 (Fall, 2007), 55-69, 56;
Willman W. Nechtman, *Nabobs: Empire and Identity in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 70;
James A Epstein, *Radical Expression*: *Political Language, Ritual, and Symbol in England 1790 – 1850* (Oxford: OUP, 1994) vii, 55, 109;
John Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Harper Collins, 1997), 338;
Betsy Bolton, 'Imperial Sensibilities, Colonial Ambivalence: Edmund Burke and Frances Burney' *ELH* 72.4 (Winter, 2005) 871 – 899, 871;
13th February 1788, Frances Burney, *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, Lorna J. Clark, ed, Vol. III, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 96 -147, 96.

until it was too late) appointed by Augusta to be their son's tutor after her husband's death.[80] In comparison to what John Bullion identified as Waldegrave's 'worldly wise counsel of a Whig Courtier who accepted the status quo in politics,' Bute:

> insisted that George had to be a serious student of books. Worldly wisdom was no substitute for learning first principles of government, politics, and finance; history revealed that the education of princes often determined, for good or ill, the fate of their people. A prince's honor, honesty, and virtue were also more valuable than being worldly-wise, for virtuous princes could change nations for the better. And Britain needed reformation; of that Bute was sure.[81]

As Hadlow sums up, 'For Bute, the lesson of history was clear: good government originated in the actions of good men.'[82] 'The King,' Bullion goes on to argue, 'was captivated by this confidence in him and this vision of what a virtuous king could achieve.'[83] Such captivation, upon George's accession, quickly turned to political favours – hence Richard Strange's difficulties. This in turn caused jealousy, especially amongst the more whiggish factions. The Duke of Devonshire detested the thought Fox might have to serve under such a social 'nobody'.[84] Such favouritism moreover 'began to create the belief that he was in some way disregarding the rights of his people' and perhaps more importantly 'strengthened the belief that George III claimed some right of ignoring the opinions of the parliamentary politicians.'[85] Nevertheless, what is important here is not just the extent to which – to go back to Hadlow – George III was influenced by Bute to generate authority via virtue, but also the extent to which the Whigs understood in this radical re-centring of royal authority in the personal qualities of the King the possible resurgence of Stuart absolutism over parliamentary democracy.

Foundational to Bute, and thus the King's, conception of virtuous authority was the primacy of the family unit. As Hadlow argues, it was '[t]he place where private virtue was most

---

[80] Hadlow, *The Strangest Family*, 107-8.
[81] John L. Bullion, 'The Prince's Mentor: A New Perspective on the Friendship between George III and Lord Bute during the 1750s', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies,* Vol. 21, No. 1 (Spring, 1989), 34-55, 45.
[82] Hadlow, 135.
[83] Ibid 46.
[84] Richard Pares, 'George III and the Politicians' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* Vol. 1. (1951), 127 – 151, 140.
[85] Pares, *George III and the Politicians,* 141, 142.

clearly expressed' for both Bute and his contemporaries, and 'in the unit that was the basic building block of society […] As a father, a husband, a brother or a son, he was answerable to the same immutable moral code that governed his actions as a king.'[86] This of course points back to Miranda J. Burgess' argument that Romance plots were used to fictionalise Hume and Smith's sentiment-based theories of human nature.[87] But it also echoes Burke's point that respect for elders and the pater familias legitimised royal authority and vice versa[88]. George and Bute's focus on virtue and family worked to legitimise Hanoverian power in the wake of the disruption of the divine right of Kings by the Protestant Settlement. Via Bute, then, George understood that the King derived his royal authority through a Christian morality expressed via his family. In turn, the royal family embodied a perfect virtue which bound society together through its gendered replicability. This return to a personal Christian model however, necessarily brought it into conflict with the constitutional foundations of post-Restoration monarchy.

This familial morality, of course, had to be displayed. Linda Colley argues that after the loss of the thirteen colonies and especially after the start of the French Revolution, a 'royal (and indeed aristocratic) resurgence was part of the conservative reaction.'[89] Pitt in particular, she notes, told the commons in May 1795 that 'a visibly brilliant royal family was the decorative counter-art to current anti-radical legislation.'[90] Spectacle, of course, was key.[91] Jeremy Black provides several further examples: on two trips to Oxford in 1785 and 1786, George spent most of the day walking around the colleges and at banquets.[92] Meanwhile, on visiting the Earl of Coventry's seat at Croome in 1788, *Berrow's Worcester Journal* recorded the King spending over two hours greeting thousands of interested spectators. [93] Just like Evelina was required to naturalise her womanhood through public performance, so too was the King required to prove his intrinsic virtue and thus articulate his kingship through the public

[86] Hadlow, *The Strangest Family*, 116.
[87] Miranda J Burgess, *British Fiction and the Production of Social Order, 1740 – 1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 18; Ruth Perry. *Novel Relations: The Transformation of Kinship in English Literature and Culture, 1748 – 1818* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 39.
[88] Bourke, *Empire and Revolution*, 694 – 5.
[89] Linda Colley, 'The Apotheosis of George III: Loyalty, Royalty and the British Nation 1760 – 1820. *Past and Present*, No. 102 (Feb. 1984), 94 – 129, 111.
[90] Ibid.
[91] "George III's reign had accustomed his subjects to expect two qualities of their monarch: first, the capacity for sporadic, glamorous show; second, a steady background of domestic responsibility and, preferably, domestic bliss. The royal *family* and not just the monarch had acquired increased currency and popularity in this period." Colley, 'The Apotheosis of George III', 124-5.
[92] Jeremy Black, *George III*, 134.
[93] Jeremy Black, *George III*, 135 – 6.

availability of his body and family. In other words, his quasi-divine kingship was legitimated by these public displays of virtue and fatherliness.

It is little surprise, then, that one of the first manifestations of George's illness expressed itself via one of his greatest familial failures: marriage. We have already seen how Frances tracked the pressures of performing courtly identity. Hadlow argues that George 'was not prepared to make sacrifices of his daughters' in the name of useful alliances on the European political stage.[94] Yet she also identifies another motive, that of self-interest. 'The princesses were everything their unsatisfactory brothers were not.' 'They were neither unruly nor unpredictable. They did not contradict, embarrass or disappoint.' In other words, there seemed little chance that he would risk marrying his daughters off and unravelling his politically useful façade of domestic bliss. On a carriage trip with his daughters The Princess Royal Charlotte ('Royal') and Augusta in November 1788 however, 'the king suddenly changed his mind' and began to apologise for having 'not secured proper matches for them.' Though expressed 'kind[ly,]' he was 'hoarse', 'agitated', and spoke with 'a degree of eagerness and rapidity that was distressing to the princesses.'[95] George had been physically ill for some time. He suffered 'a strong bilious attack' in June that year.[96] Though he seemed recovered by August, mid-October saw its return with a vengeance. By late October George began speaking uncontrollably and nonsensically. 'Problems with sight, hearing and memory followed.'[97] Yet it was this encounter on 5th November which marked the first serious prolonged crisis, which separated him first from his family and which instigated a constitutional crisis. George's illness was not therefore solely a profound private tragedy but marked a political crisis that went beyond the well-attested political wrangling of the regency crisis. With the theatricality of Hastings' trial bringing the imperial project and colonial body into public focus, the unhooking of the King's mind and body was not just personally and politically problematic but threatened a breakdown in the wider body politic.

Burney's account shows her fear for the constitution. Looking back on the events of the 5th November, Burney laments a 'Dreadful day', terrible yet necessary to relate, because 'my

[94] Hadlow, *The Strangest Family*, 349.
[95] Hadlow, *The Strangest Family*, *351*.
[96] Black, *George III*, 276.
[97] Ibid.

dear friends have never yet had the beginning of the Thread which led to all the terrible scenes of which they have variously heard.'[98]

> I found my poor Royal Mistress, in the morning, sad & sadder still; something horrible seemed impending, & I saw her whole resource was in Religion. We have talked lately much upon solemn subjects, & she appeared already preparing herself to be resigned for whatever might happen. I was still wholly unsuspicious of the greatness of the cause she had for dread! – Illness – a breaking up of the Constitution, - the payment of sudden infirmity, & premature old age, for the waste of unguarded health and Strength, - these seemed to me the threats awaiting her - & great & grievous enough, - yet how short of the fact! [99]

Charlotte may give herself up to religion, but Frances knows Anglican faith is inextricable from a diseased body politic. While it is the King who is ill, Burney mixes his complaints with Charlotte's, leaving it ambiguous who might suffer 'sudden infirmity' or 'premature old age.' 'Illness' and 'constitution' are elided. The King's body underpins not just to the royal family but encompasses the wider populace. Because the King's sovereignty relies on his public displays of virtue, moderation, and sociability among the people rather than his utter seclusion from them – despite the autocratic tendencies of centring personal morality – a weakening of the King's 'constitution' threatens the Protestant Settlement. The King was acutely conscious of the wider stakes. Burney wrote to Susanna on the first of the month that the King was 'very sensible of the great change there is in him […] a threat of a total break up of the constitution.'[100] Frances' account of the royal household at the time of the king's illness therefore continues her exploration of the failures of British national identity against the contradictions of Kingship. Yet just as it raised the spectre of new struggles over Hanoverian legitimacy that Burney had first articulated in the assassination attempt, the King's erratic behaviour brought with it only further turmoil.

The Queen's claims to enlightened womanhood are shown to be wholly subordinate to her husband. In the middle of the night of 5th November, Dr Warren, physician to the Prince of

[98] Frances Burney to Susanna Burney Phillips, 5th November 1788, Lorna J. Clark ed, *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, Vol. IV, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.)509 - 516, 509.
[99] ibid
[100] Frances Burney to Susanna Burney Phillips, 1st November 1788, Lorna J. Clark ed, *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, Vol. IV, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 503 – 5, 504.

Wales, was summoned. The King however, motivated in part by distrust of anyone associated with the Prince of Wales, refused to see him. While the Queen assumed he would bring her news of George's condition, he left without a word. "Run! – Stop him! – " was the Queen's next order. – 'Let him but let me know what *I* am to do!" Burney reports, however, that

> Dr Warren, with the other two physicians, […] were gone over to the castle – to the prince of wales! –
> I think a deeper blow I have never yet witnessed! – *already* to become but second, even for the King!
> […]
> the poor wretched Queen once more gave way to a perfect agony of grief & affliction – while the words "*What will become of me! – what will become of me*!" uttered with the most piercing lamentation, struck deep & hard into all our hearts.[101]

The Queen here articulates the poverty and contingency of her authority. Unlike her husband, able to step outside the ritual of his authority so easily, the Queen's sovereignty disappears with his sanity. The doctor sent for is that of the Prince of Wales, and it is immediately apparent that he answers to her eldest son rather than her; any power she has due to her husband's position immediately evaporates once his authority questioned. Now the King appears to be on the verge of death, Charlotte laments how her status not just as a queen, but as a British woman by virtue of her marriage has come into question. Demanding to know 'what will become of me!', she bemoans a decay of patriarchal authority and responsibility that threatens to tip the household into chaos and concurrently her failure to create a sense of female community at and against the court.

The breakdown of royal authority is marked by the threat of sexual violence. As Dr Warren failed to examine his patient, Colonel Goldsworthy 'brought the opinion of All the physicians' that the Queen should change apartments.[102] She instantly agreed, and along with Burney, Lady Elizabeth, and Miss Goldsworthy removed to another apartment in the same

[101] Frances Burney to Susanna Burney Phillips, 6th November 1788, Lorna J. Clark ed, *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, Vol. IV, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 516 – 528, 523.

[102] Ibid, 523.

range, ‘to which there was no entrance except by its own door.’ Colonel Goldsworthy and the physicians worried about the Queen’s safety from the King. As Hadlow remarks:

> Writing in late November, James Bland Burges, a politician with connections to the royal household, reported a disturbing story he had heard: The first symptom of the King’s madness was his running naked into the queen’s room, he insisted upon throwing her on the bed and that the women in the room should stand by to see whether he did well.’ A few days later, Burgess recorded that the king ‘seized the Princess Royal, and attempted to ravish her. She was rescued from him with great difficulty, and he was at such a rage at his disappointment as to strike the queen.’[103]

Mad, the King articulates an understanding of sanity and authority as rooted in sexual domination and judged by a female audience. Yet his disregard for ritualised courting, and threats of rape, troublingly expose the subordination of consent in supposedly sane life to patriarchal whim. It is impossible to judge the veracity of Burges’ claims, although it illuminates the colour of the panic gripping the royal household as the Queen’s hopes of Protestant convents are transmuted to the worst Protestant suspicions of Popish monasteries. Burney’s close attention to female solidarity and the need for protection from the King nevertheless points to how the threat of sexual violence was associated with the King’s malady. Just as Mirvan and Duval show how Anglican Womanhood is underwritten with the unspoken threat of sexual violence, Burney’s experience at court demonstrated the breakdown of patriarchy only brought with it an intensification of that threat into incest in the King’s attempted ‘ravish[ing]’ of his daughter. The breakdown of the King’s masculinity does not therefore signal a revolution in enlightened masculinity. Far from it. The worst impulses Burney had identified in Captain Mirvan, Mr Harrel, and Mr Monckton are merely freed from the paradoxically reversible Christian morality to abuse without the false promise of restraint.

The emphasis on restraint is particularly visible in the appointment of Francis Willis. As December approached, the King’s behaviour worsened. By 3rd December, serious questions were being raised before the Privy Council as to the likelihood of the King’s recovery. As they were unable to agree, and the prospect of a cure became less likely, they turned instead

[103] Hadlow, 367.

to Francis Willis, who had run 'a private lunatic asylum at Greatford near Stamford for over a decade': By this point, the King's marriage had been strained by psychotic accusations of the Queen's infidelity and professions of love to her servants.

> Willis was recommended by the Harcourts, [and] declared that George would recover, proved a controversial figure, first because he insisted on exclusive medical control and, second, because of his methods, which rested on enforced calm, including the use of a gag, a strait-jacket and a restraining chair. The restraint was designed to end the over-excitement that he believed caused madness. The majesty of monarchy was ignored as George was bullied and coerced. [104]

Critical here is the return of the pre-modern body; just as Mrs Delvile is undone by its demands when she fails to adequately perform British identity, so too does the King's body require a physical rebalancing in order to restore mental equilibrium.[105] This is not to argue for a direct causal link between wider political stress and mental illness. Nevertheless, it remains widely accepted that 'significant historical events' coincided with the King's illnesses, most notably the American War of Independence.[106] As Laqueur goes on to note, Tocqueville identified in the American War of independence the destruction of 'the old basis for patriarchal authority.'[107] The novelty of Willis' focus on restraint must therefore be viewed in this context, and the essence of his treatment identified as an attempt to reshape the royal body and reassert a rightly ordered and imperial body politic.

Willis' treatment saw the King re-learning how to perform politeness. As well as shaving himself, Willis permitted George to read Shakespeare.[108] As John Brewer pointed out, the mid eighteenth century saw a crisis of authorial authority on the stage:

> Actors developed distinctive repertories not so much to express particular emotions, though this was important, but to develop their own *interpretations*. […] Interpretations came from the actor's performance, not the play's text. This message, repeatedly

[104] Black, *George III*, 278.
[105] Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1990), 107.
[106] Timothy J. Peters & Allan Beveridge, 'The Madness of King George III: a Psychiatric Re-Assessment' *History of Psychiatry*, 21(1), 20-37, 23
[107] Laqueur, *Making Sex*, 157.
[108] Black, *George* III, 278.

> reiterated by David Garrick and strongly endorsed by others, claimed the stage rather than the page as the place where drama was to be interpreted. Entire plays as well as individual roles were to be understood through their enactment. [109]

With Garrick's success as a Shakespearean actor, in Vanessa Cunningham's words, 'cast[ing] a long shadow' over the rest of the century, it is impossible to consider Willis' behavioural 'cure' apart from Garrick's theories of embodiment.[110] While at first glance Willis' treatment seems to be anti-Garrick in its privileging of an authoritative text, the usage of Shakespeare forms part of Willis' wider treatment. Permitting the King to shave himself and read Shakespeare seeks to link him back into the performative culture of politeness and kingship. In other words, reading Shakespeare – via – Garrick should prompt George to 'develop [his] own *interpretation*' and thereby return to sanity. It is thus telling that a signal of his lucidity during a recovery January 1789 was a remark to his daughters that he had been reading King Lear, but was neither like the King, and had only three Cordelias.[111] The King here acknowledged the necessity of performance, and was able to compartmentalise and control his behaviour accordingly. He had become himself again.[112] This, of course, is unsettling in its acknowledgement of the essential performativity of Kingship as nothing more or less than a dramatic role. To read this in neo-material terms, George III regains his sanity and subjectivity through use of text, object, and environment in a repeat of Bute's early tutorials.

Yet if George was being trained to take to the stage, the arrival of Willis coincided with a concerted effort to keep the King away from the public eye. The King's illness deepened through early November. On Sunday 9th 'No one went to Church; not a creature now quits the house: but I believe devotion never less required the aid & influence of public worship!'[113] Nevertheless, the possibility of 'public worship' was to be further restricted. As December loomed, it was decided to swap Windsor for Kew.[114] Burney looked upon the transition with nothing less than despair:

---

[109] John Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Harper Collins, 1997), 337 – 8.
[110] Vanessa Cunningham, *Shakespeare and Garrick* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 53
[111] Flora Fraser, *Princesses: The Six Daughters of George III* (London: John Murray, 2004), 120.
[112] In her Journal, 26th March 1775, Frances recounts her meeting with Mr Garrick, explaining his 'drollery' was evident not in her written account, but only in his 'Voice, looks, and manners.' In other words, text guides, but only material embodiment creates distinct character. *Journals and Letters*, 42 – 45.
[113] Frances Burney, Journal Entry, Sunday 9th November 1788, Lorna J. Clark, ed. *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, VOL. IV. 537 – 540, 537.
[114] Joyce Hemlow, *The History of Fanny Burney* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), 207.

> The prospect before us, with respect to Kew, is indeed terrible. There is to be a total seclusion from all but those within the Walls, & those are to be contracted to merely necessary attendants. Mr Digby disapproved the scheme, though a gainer by it of leisure & liberty; [115]

The aim here was twofold. Firstly, to ensure that George 'was by no means to see the Queen.'[116] Secondly, to institute a stricter treatment regime in a tightly controlled environment, where there was less chance of a leak to the outside world. [117] The emphasis on visibility here is important, betraying as it does the extent to which royal authority and visibility was inextricably linked. Willis' appearance – he was summoned soon after their arrival at Kew – in this environment therefore suggests that the purpose of the four months spent at Kew was to be a refashioning of the King's body to prepare it for visibility.[118] Yet as Frances would have well known, had she been permitted to write at length about the King's condition, such a privation from a theatrical surveillance which the King sustained and by which he was sustained only further destabilised British identity.

The King's absence re-ignited debates about the constitutional role of the King. After appearing disordered and muddled at a levee supposed to reassure the public about his health, George first acknowledged his inability to conduct official business on 24th October, instructing Pitt 'not to send him any official business for a week.'[119] By mid-November, however, neither the King's death nor his recovery seemed probable. With Parliament unable to do business till re-opened by the King, the question was now who would rule in his stead and how they would do so.[120] Even from early November, the Queen had felt her power in the household fade alongside that of her husband's, while her miscreant eldest son supplanted her. As Hadlow notes, her position in the household had become provisional.[121] Although Queen Charlotte's name had been floated as a possibility, the Prince of Wales 'now of age'

---

[115] Frances Burney, Journal Entry, Thursday 27th November 1788, Lorna J. Clark, ed. *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, VOL. IV 593 – 595.
[116] Frances Burney, journal entry, Saturday, November 29, Lorna J. Clark, ed. *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, Vol. iv, 600 – 612, 609.
[117] Hadlow, *The Strangest Family,* 381 – 2.
[118] Hemlow, *The History of Fanny Burney*, 208-9.
[119] Hadlow, *The Strangest Family,* 359.
[120] Fintan O'Toole, *A Traitor's Kiss: The Life of Richard Brinsley Sheridan* (New York: FSG, 1998), 237.
[121] Hadlow, *The Strangest Family,* 369.

would be regent.[122] This raised the spectre of a new ministry, and the possible ascent of the Prince's close associate Charles James Fox. Yet this would have to be debated by parliament, whose meeting had been adjourned. 'As with other monarch supposed mad, the perception of George's mental health in part mirrored political interests. The political interest and inherent drama of the occasion attracted intense public interest.'[123] In particular, there was widespread public recrimination over the perception that the Whig faction, along with the Prince of Wales, were less than eager for the King's recuperation. Even after 3rd December, when Willis was called in and the new regime with its promises of recovery implemented, clashes in parliament over the Regency Bill continued. Unsurprisingly, the Tory faction backed Willis against the scepticism of Warren and the other doctors. [124] The King's sickroom at Kew was 'soon as highly politicised as the House of Commons.'[125] The Prince of Wales had been planning his new cabinet since early November, and there was no sign of that he would call on Pitt. 'Faced with the prospect of political obliteration' all Pitt could do was 'play for time.'[126]

The main quarrel over the Regency Bill was centred on the balance of power between parliament and court. While Fox hurried from Italy, Pitt argued that Willis' opinion that the King was likely to recover meant that severe limitations should be placed on the regent's power to modify his father's government.[127] By the 10th of December Fox 'had resolved to argue for the prince's right to the regency without the imposition of restrictions.'[128] At first, Fox 'accepted the analysis propounded by Burke', yet as the debates ground on and what little cohesion possessed by the Whigs fragmented, Burke's position became increasingly idiosyncratic. Suspecting that Fox cared more for consolidating political power:

> On 22 December 1788, Burke spoke at length on an amendment to Pitt's resolution that the house should define the terms of the regency. […] By early February 1789, Burke's animus against attempts to impose restrictions on the regency had become focused on

[122] Black, *King George III,* 277. Although Fraser suggests that the Queen wanted no part of any political influence. Fraser, *Princesses: The Six Daughters of George III,* 111.
[123] Ibid.
[124] Nicholas Robinson, 'Caricature and the Regency Crisis: An Irish Perspective' *Eighteenth-Century Ireland / Iris an dá chultúr*, Vol. 1 (1986), 157-176, 159.
[125] Hadlow, *The Strangest Family,* 390.
[126] Hadlow, *Strangest Family,* 391.
[127] William Hague, *William Pitt the Younger* (London: Harper Perennial, 2005), 254.
[128] Richard Bourke, *Empire and Revolution: The Political Life of Edmund Burke* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2015), 592.

> the ambitions of William Pitt. The "heaven-born" minister, as Burke now styled him, was bent upon the revival of divine-right despotism, promoted under cover of democratic zeal. [129]

Although Bourke noted that Pitt's attempts 'threatened to create a form of elective monarchy', it also signalled a wider attempt to shift the centre of political power from the person of the monarch to the people.[130] This is striking in its implications for our understanding of the King's body after 1688. William Blackstone argued that the law ascribes to the king's 'political capacity, an absolute immortality.'[131] In other words, the revolution weakened a 'nominal' power of the crown but left its 'real' power intact.[132] Halliday also remarks that in diverging from Edward Coke's splitting of the royal body into the natural body (to which one owed allegiance) and his political body (to which one did not), Blackstone's 'conflat[ion] of the two bodies' nevertheless promoted a disunity which in turn permitted the perpetuity of majesty upon death, from King to his Heir, through the law.[133] Whereas magistrates traditionally spoke with the King's voice, 'Blackstone here reduces the King to an image reflected by others' and in so doing 'disembodied the King [and] embodied the law.'[134] Pitt's attempt to find authority in the executive parliament, rather than the King's newly unstable body, threatened to undermine contemporary understandings of both the corporeal and legal basis of Hanoverian legitimacy.

The Regency Crisis therefore exposed existing weaknesses of Hanoverian sovereignty. Fintan O'Toole argued that '[t]he crisis exposed, ironically on its hundredth anniversary, the vulnerability of the British constitution established by the Glorious Revolution of 1688.[135] Yet J.R Dinwiddy argues that Charles James Fox was under no illusions about the origins of the crisis. Considering his *History of the Early Part of the Reign of James II* (1808), only published two years after his death, he argued:

---

[129] Bourke, *Empire and Revolution,* 593, 4.
[130] Bourke, *Empire and Revolution,* 594.
[131] William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England, in Four Books* Vol. I. Twelfth Edition, (London, T. Cadell. 1793), 249.
[132] Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), 23.
[133] Paul D Halliday, 'Blackstone's King' in Wilfred Priest, ed. *Re-interpreting Blackstone's Commentaries: A Seminal Text in National and International Contexts* (Oxford and Portland, Oregon: Hart Publishing, 2014), 169 – 188, 178-9.
[134] Ibid.
[135] Fintan O'Toole, *A Traitor's Kiss,* 237.

> the Whigs alone could be credited with 'just notions of liberty' and of course he believed this to be true not only for the later Stuart period, but also for the reign of George III. […] he frequently referred to Hume's remark that absolute monarchy is 'the easiest death, the true Euthanasia of the British constitution.' Fox thought his own times were not very different from the period before the Glorious revolution. […] Fox's analysis of Whig and Tory views of the prerogative [moreover] arose out of a discussion of the Exclusion Bill, but it contained an implicit justification of the behaviour of the Whigs during the Regency Crisis of 1788-9.[136]

This then underscores the extent to which Humean debates of ad hoc and performative legitimacy infused the court, and thus this thesis's wider assertion that Burney's thought was distinctly Humean. The Glorious Revolution had hardly settled debates. George's unfortunate tendency to emphasise his continuity with his Stuart predecessors now risked undermining the relationship between court, parliament, and the people. Fox therefore rightly conceived of the parliamentary debates over the regency bill as a much deeper struggle over history and sovereignty. It is important, then, to return to Burney's identification of the gendered body as a site on which wider national identities and loyalties were contested, and naturalised. Like Burney, Fox, Pitt, and Burke all understood how debates over the King's medicalised body stood in for deeper questions about the body politic in the wake of the seventeenth century.

Burney's court tragedies were therefore reflections of her troubling experiences of Regency Crisis. Margaret Anne Doody notes the prevalence of words like 'conflict,' 'monastic,' 'tyranny' in the court diaries and argues that 'these metaphors […] supply plots and actions for the series of plays in which Frances tried to work out her own situation.':[137]

> she wrote three tragic plays and a lengthy if fragmentary sketch of a fourth during her royal incarceration. […] Each play has a good father figure, and a bad one who is authoritarian (often a King) and forever unapproachable by the heroine or "suppliant virgin" […] Each play deals with civil war […] Burney began the first of these

[136] J.R Dinwiddy, "Charles James Fox as Historian." *The Historical Journal* Vol.12, No. 1 (1969): 23–34, 30.
[137] Margaret Anne Doody, *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1988), 177.

> tragedies in October 1788, when the king had just entered the worst phase of that illness of 1788 – 1789 […] and was thought mad.[138]

The quality of these plays has often been at best politely skipped over.[139] If they are given any merit at all, it is because they are seen as a way for Burney to channel the frustrations of court life; as acts of automatic writing in places, and sites on which Burney could displace the trauma of confinement that threatened to spill over into illness and suicide. [140] But as Barbara Darby points out, 'Burney's account of her tragedies is interwoven with her first-hand experience of the king's illness.'[141] When she first noted in her journal of October 19th 1788 that she 'had just begun a tragedy' she did so in order that she might 'while away the tediousness of this unsettled – unoccupied – unpleasant period.'[142] By mid-November however, when physical illness had blossomed into mental catastrophe, she was forced to abandon 'my melancholy resource, my tragedy,' because 'misery so actual, living & present, was knit too closely around me.'[143] Tragedy, then, allowed her both to express and manage the trauma of the regency crisis, but since its questions of national identity and character were at once historical and personal, it remained a fraught exercise.

Burney's first tragedy *Edwy and Elgiva* demonstrates that Burney was perfectly aware of the historical and constitutional precedents surrounding the regency crisis. Burney's surviving Juvenalia shows her reading peppered with history, 'especially classical narratives', which spanned from Dryden, to Middleton, to Hume.[144]

> Edwy and Elgiva is an adaptation of a story Burney found in British histories by David Hume, Tobias Smollett, and M. (Paul) Rapin de Thoyâs. It is the tale of a tenth-century monarch, Edwy, who married his kinswoman, Elgiva, and faced the opposition of the Roman Catholic clergy led by Abbot Dunstan. In the sources, Dunstan kidnaps Elgiva

[138] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 178, 9.
[139] Peter Sabor, 'General Introduction,' Peter Sabor, ed. *The Complete Plays of Frances Burney,* Vol. I Comedies, (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1995), xi – xli, xxx,
[140] Claire Harman, *Fanny Burney: A Biography* (London: Flamingo, 2001), 225 – 6.
[141] Barbara Darby, *Frances Burney, Dramatist: Gender, Performance, and the Late Eighteenth-Century Stage* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1997), 44.
[142] Journal Sunday 19th October 1788, Lorna J. Clark ed, *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, Vol. IV, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 487 – 488, 488.
[143] Journal, Sunday 9th November, 1788, Lorna J. Clark ed, *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, Vol. IV, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014),537 – 540, 537 – 8.
[144] Janice Farrar Thaddeus, *Frances Burney: A Literary Life* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), 104.

> and tortures her in ways that include branding, ham-stringing, and banishment. Edwy is accused of lasciviousness, effeminate desires, and improper government.[145]

Harman points out that although Edwy and Elgiva was probably – unsurprisingly - adapted from Hume's *History of England,* it also 'tapp[ed] into the late-eighteenth-century nationalist vogue for the Anglo-Saxon Period.[146] Yet as Robert Tombs rightly argues, the *History of England* (1757) was written with the specific aim of 'effac[ing] the dangerous Whig-Tory party rage, dismissing the Anglo-Saxons as 'aristocratical' and denying the Whig Shibboleth that liberty came from resistance to the crown.[147] Though Hume claimed to be a sceptical Whig, 'it is difficult to imagine a more effective Tory history,' and cries of 'roundheads' followed the King's critics for the next century.[148] Writing an Anglo-Saxon based tragedy cribbed from Hume must therefore be seen as an explicitly political act, especially in the context of the wider engagement with Hume's political philosophy throughout her novels.

This play's focus on usurpation therefore comes to reflect Burney's profound cynicism regarding debates around royal legitimacy. The best example of this requires us to return to Doody's summary of the plot, 'which chiefly concerns the desire of King Edwy to marry Elgiva, his "kinswoman,"' which his council immediately declares contrary to 'canon law':

> Even more antagonistic is the monk Dunstan, the self-proclaimed saint. Edwy agrees to postpone the matter until after his coronation, but he and Elgiva are actually (like Mortimer and Cecilia) secretly married. When Elgiva is accused of being his concubine, Edwy reveals his secret marriage. […] Edwy sentences [an outraged] Dunstan to exile. [Elgiva is once again abducted, but] Aldhelm, Edwy's well-meaning advisor, tells the King he must not search for her during a constitutional crisis. Dunstan's supporters are rising; civil war is at hand.[149]

There is of course no happy ending. Dunstan's henchmen stab Elgiva, who dies in Edwy's arms. Edwy attempts to revenge her, only to fall to Dunstan, who is immediately wracked

[145] Barbara Darby, 'Feminism, Tragedy, and Frances Burney's *Edwy and Elgiva,' Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism,* Vol. 11, No. 2 (Spring 1997), 3 – 24, 4.
[146] Harman, *Fanny Burney,* 225.
[147] Robert Tombs, *The English and Their History* (London: Penguin, 2014), 263-4
[148] Ibid.
[149] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 180.

with remorse. While Doody draws attention to the patriarchal and sexually repressive nature of Dunstan in contrast to the subversively romantic love between the two lead characters, the constitutional questions raised by the marriage cannot be ignored. The prologue decries 'Rome's stern usurpation' a 'disgraceful usurpation which Henry broke' in a Humean proclamation of quasi-divine right.[150] What shouldn't be surprising however is that this is prefaced by a strong defence of the Catholic faith's reconquest of post-Roman Britain as 'some holy Seer imprest / The Christian doctrines on a Britons breast / idolatry retreats and tenets pure.'[151] Burney thus affirms the Catholicity of England while affirming the Gallican primacy of Kings over 'imperious pontiffs'[152] Yet in highlighting the primacy of monarchy, Burney echoes Hume and stymies the right of the people to dislodge James II for Catholicism. That *Edwy and Elgiva* ends with a lone Dunstan proclaiming a 'remorse' which 'grasp[s] my disordered soul' therefore signals a profound disquiet about Hanoverian legitimacy.[153] Dunstan's outcry of Smith-esque emotion in turn reflects later attempts to patch over dynastic lacunae. Moreover, one of the major 'faults' of the play, Edwy and Elgiva's focus on reported speech over direct action, makes more sense if we consider the confinement of the King away from a household forced to rely on doctor's accounts and whispers in corridors. Their ends which take place off stage, like George's confinement, has none of the finality of spectacle. Like the Stuarts or King George, their legitimacy continues to haunt those, like Duncan, who would take their place.

By late December and early January, the King was enjoying ever-longer periods of lucidity.[154] In February, Willis considered him well enough to permit him to walk around the gardens. This lead to Frances Burney's famous encounter where she was chased 'too terrified to stop' by the king, 'loudly and hoarsely calling after me', until Willis convinced her to pause lest the king 'overheat.'[155] By mid-February, Frances was celebrating 'a most memorable day'; the King had improved to the degree that 'the Regency was put off, in the House of Lords, by a motion from the Chancellor.'[156] The King's physicians finally proclaimed a complete recovery on the 26th of February, with parliament congratulating the

[150] Frances Burney, 'Edwy and Elgiva', Peter Sabor, ed. *The Complete Plays of Frances Burney,* Vol. II: Tragedies (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1995), prologue l44, 37.
[151] Ibid, prologue, l.3-5.
[152] Ibid, prologue, l20.
[153] Ibid, V.xx.1-2.
[154] Fraser, *Princesses*, 119 – 20.
[155] Frances Burney to Susanna Burney Phillips, Monday 2nd February 1789, Geoffrey Sill, ed. *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney,* Vol. V, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2015), 103 – 112, 104 – 5.
[156] Frances Burney to Susanna Burney Phillips, Thursday 19th February 1789, Geoffrey Sill, ed. *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney,* Vol. V, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2015),150 – 151, 150.

Queen on the 10th of March.[157] On the 23rd of April 'six thousand children' sang for the King at St Paul's Cathedral on St George's day.[158] As Holger Hoock sums up:

> King George III and his still young prime minister William Pitt reinvented St Paul's cathedral in the city of London as a site of national ceremony. […] In his sermon, the Bishop of London asserted that the King in his person represented every thing [sic] that is dear and valuable to us, as men, as Britons, and as Christians.'[159]

In other words, the King's sovereignty was demonstrated by his ability to gather his subjects to re-enter into dialogue with and exert pressure on, his material religious environment in a repeat of the delight of Cumberland's quashing of the '45. Just as the withdrawal of the king from the public eye must be read as a failed attempt to restrict the damage done from a King failing to adequately perform kingship, so too must his exhibition be seen as further evidence of the critical nature of (reciprocal) visibility to Hanoverian legitimacy.[160] Indeed, as Hoock's main thesis on the relationship of politics, culture, and war states: '[v]isualisation helped audiences at home imagine and conceptualise a globally connected empire.'[161] Linda Colley argues that such visibility was part of a wider attempt to express political power via national celebration rather than direct political engagement. [162] The public nature of his illness in 1788-9, she contends, cancelled out earlier fears about his autocratic tendencies with a 'surge of pity' that cemented his legitimacy.[163] Whether or not any popularity intensified after his illness requires further investigation. Here, however, the Bishop of London's argument that

---

[157] Geoffrey de Bellaigue, 'Huzza the King is well!' *The Burlington Magazine,* Vol. 126, No. 985 (June 1984), 325 – 331, 325.
[158] Hague, *Pitt the Younger,* 267.
[159] Holger Hoock, *Empires of the Imagination: Politics, War, and the Arts in the British World, 1750 – 185* (London: Profile Books, 2010), 132.
[160] An anonymous account of music played during the thanksgiving service in the Fulham Papers at Lambeth Palace Library lists:

Overture of Esther
Coronation Anthem
Dettingden Te Deum
Handel's jubilate
Anthem my heart is intending

At the end of the service
Chorus out of Joseph
O lord who is in thy heavenly hand

Fulham Papers 17, f.173, Lambeth Palace Library.

[161] Hoock, *Empires of the Imagination,* 6.
[162] Linda Colley, 'The Apotheosis of George III,' 104-6.
[163] Linda Colley, *Britons,* 226.

the King's person 'represented every thing that is dear and valuable to us' can be read not only as a statement of fact, but a desperate proclamation of shared emotional intent in the face of a constitutional crisis that had shaken the foundations of British identity.

Frances Burney's court writing only further underscores the centrality of debates over commerce, sovereignty, and religion to her published work. A careful examination of her discussion of the King and Queen also illuminates how doubts and anxieties of Hanoverian legitimacy drove court and parliament even before the Regency Crisis of the late 1780s. Royal attempts to find a sense of reformed continuity only underscored the disjunction of 1688 at best and at worst hinted that the King sought to reclaim Stuart autocratic rights over the parliament. A key example of this is the Queen's convent-coterie. The Queen's offer of a place at court for Burney was not just a Royal gift to her family, but also reflected a wider lamentation of the loss of an alternative to marriage for women with the Dissolution of the monasteries. In creating a vibrant circle around the Princesses – for whom the prospect of marriage remained far off – then, the Queen sought to create a space in which women could study and live without the pressures of the marriage market. Yet as Burney understood, Astell, Montagu, and Wesley's reformed conceptions of religious houses relied on voluntary association. Burney, of course, had no say in whether she wished to join the court. She had no say in when the bell which summoned her to the Queen rang, and the pressures of performing court identity were worse than the polite identity outside. It is no wonder, then, that the monastic metaphors which abound in her letters and journals tend to the Gothic. To build on George Haggarty's argument that 'community is unthinkable' for independent women in Burney's novels, such a conclusion qua nationality was only begrudgingly reached as she resigned herself to a communion with her fellow religieuse.[164] Even if there appears to be a group of women living together, they are still at the beck and call of a higher authority, their agency counts for nothing. As Haggarty argues, this therefore implies that Burney works against the idea of the nation because she comes to understand that trust and community cannot be trusted.[165] British national identity then means little. It is Hanoverian identity, and loyalty to the King, which remains critical. Her essentially Humean rationale that it was better to have the Hanoverians monopoly of violence rather than a return to civil war.

[164] George E. Haggarty, 'A Friend, a Fop, and a Feminist: The Failure of Community in Burney', *The Eighteenth Century,* Vol. 36, No. 3, The Contradictions of "Community" (Autumn 1995), 248-265, 248.
[165] Haggarty, 249-50.

But how justify her love for the King and Queen with the suffering and precarity their rule causes? The beginnings of a framework can be seen in the turmoil of the Regency Crisis. As we have seen, the King's illness and the struggles over where the limits of the Regent's power would lay point not just to the enduring crisis of the 1640s and 1688, but accordingly excavate the continuing struggle for power between parliament and court. Burney's love for the King and horror at his political framework and authority point to an attempt to theorise a Hanoverian version of Coke's two bodies. If Blackstone in turn collapsed this distinction in order to embody the law (i.e the King's power derived from his political body, and not in Stuart terms his personal body), then the King's attempts to derive authority from his personal morality risked a return to Coke's conception. Burney personal loyalty and political unease therefore point not only to the existence of these debates, both around and by the King, but also to the ideological gymnastics undergone by reluctant loyalists. Indeed, this embodiment of the law via polite identity can be seen by Dr Willis's attempts to mould the stricken King back into behaviour suitable for public performance, teaching him how to shave himself once more and reading Shakespeare for inspiration before he can take his place once more as a keystone of embodied law. This in turn suggests that our conceptions of loyalism in the eighteenth century must be seen in the context of these much older legal debates on the nature of the King's authority. [166]In this case, Burney argues that the conflation of the King with the Law permits those such as Captain Mirvan to speak with the voice of the King and adopt legal authority. By using Elizabethan defences of sovereignty which split the King's body, Frances can rationalise her love for the King and her hatred for the excesses of post-Stuart monarchy.

[166] This underscores McCormack's argument that Loyalism and Patriotism were not synonyms, but involved subtley different ideological commitments. Matthew McCormack, *The Independent Man: Citizenship and Gender Politics in Georgian England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 141.

Chapter four: '[W]rite with thy own hand thy claims, thy merits to mercy': French Émigrés In England And The Unravelling Of Polite Society In Frances Burney's *Camilla* (1796)

Much like its predecessors, *Camilla* (1796) is ostensibly a novel about marriage. Camilla lives '[i]n the home of her respectable family.'[1] Naturally, 'nature […] had been lavish to her of attractions,' and alongside a decidedly Anglican wealth somewhere 'between luxury and indigence,' she lives near the New Forest 'in the parson house of Etherington, [where] her father, the rector, was the younger son of the house of Tyrold.'[2] The narrative impetus is provided by the arrival of her father's eldest brother, Sir Hugh Tyrold. Moving from his ancestral estate in Yorkshire, in classic eighteenth-century fashion, he immediately ranks his nieces according to beauty. Of all his nieces, he prefers Camilla. Even though she '"is not" he cried, 'so pretty as her little sister Eugenia, nor much better than t'other sister Lavina; and not one of the three is half so great a beauty as my little Indiana.'[3] Camilla is promptly made Sir Hugh Tyrold's heir, and – though her parents are reluctant – is brought to live with him at his new estate. Tragedy strikes. Sir Hugh permits Eugenia to go to a local fair, where she promptly catches smallpox; disfigured, she then falls off a horse, leaving her permanently disabled. In the pangs of remorse, Sir Hugh makes Eugenia his sole heir, only to immediately be consumed with shame for disinheriting his beloved Camilla. As Elizabeth Rose Grunner has pointed out, '*Camilla* is Frances Burney's most puzzling novel, and its eponymous protagonist her most puzzling heroine.'[4] Its 'courtship is more familial than romantic' she argues, and the heroine 'is more sinned against than sinning.'[5] She argues the novel is 'neither courtesy book nor cautionary tale', and instead draws on Levi-Strauss's argument that society is based on the exchange of women to explore the position of women

[1] Frances Burney, *Camilla* (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 8.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Burney, *Camilla*, 11.
[4] Elizabeth Rose Grunner, 'The Bullfinch and the Brother: Marriage and Family in Frances Burney's "Camilla", *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol. 93, No. 1, (Jan., 1994), 18-34, 18.
[5] Ibid.

within the family structure.[6] Grunner thus proffers a reading close to Hemlow's didactic conception and Doody's reading of a family wracked by financial crises. [7]

This chapter, however, argues that it is haunted by the presence of the French Catholic emigres in England. If *Cecilia* was obsessed with the question of how to integrate Catholic families into polite spaces, ultimately arguing that politeness as performed by Catholics aimed to both prove Hanoverian claims to Protestant liberty and moderation and neutralise their own claims to British identity, then *Camilla* extends this to entire groups. The influx of French Catholics and the shift from Francophobic anti-Catholicism to anti-Jacobinism as raison d'etre of the British state was seen by Burney as an existential crisis for a social order which depended on ignoring the sectarian bloodshed on which Protestant moderation was built. With the influx of French Catholics, the question and memories of religious difference and popular bloodshed were almost impossible to ignore. As Burney theorised in *Evelina* and *Cecilia*, politeness lacks the language in which to work through these differences. Since they can no longer be ignored, but neither can they be discussed and worked through, British society threatens to crumble to the same popular violence seen in France. In this way, Burney shows herself typically pre-occupied with the threat of violence and its role in history. Contra Doody et al., this is not a novel reflective of a hermit like existence, Frances' psychological struggles, or even a straightforward meditation on the horrors of life at court. Rather it continues to be reflective of an engagement with Smith, with the conduct novels, and as Hemlow says, of an engagement with political philosophy.[8] As Grunner says, Burney is typically obsessed by the marketplace. But the morass and 'confused' plot reflects this, as she attempts and ultimately fails to find parallels in genre and history.

As we might expect, questions of primogeniture and inheritance serve as metaphors for questions of national sovereignty and legitimacy. A young woman is infected with smallpox

[6] Grunner, 'The Bullfinch…', 20.
[7] Hemlow argues that *Camilla* and *The Wanderer* must be read as a refutation of the novelty of Rousseau in favour of its antecedents in Locke. Joyce Hemlow, 'Fanny Burney and the Courtesy Books', *PMLA,* Vol. 65, No. 5 (Sep., 1950), 732 – 761, *745-6;*
Doody, on the other hand, argues that Hemlow and the Blooms misread *Camilla*, and that while Burney originally considered writing a novel of that type, reading the drafts, scraps, and notes of the work in progress shows that 'the work ahead was to be about a family that falls on hard times.' Margaret Anne Doody, *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1988), 206-7.
[8] Zonitch indeed argues that Burney has written an anti-conduct book, one in which Sir Hugh Tyrold's advice consciously mirrors that of Adam Smith's Treatise. Barbara Zonitch *Familiar Violence: Gender and Social Upheaval in the Novels of Frances Burney* (London: University of Delaware Press, 1997)
98

during a trip to the marketplace, an accident which upends the well-ordered inheritance of the family and marks her out with scars explicitly compared to the currency of the slave trade. The ranking of beauty is soon followed by the ranking of racial difference. Woman, Burney argues, is disfigured by exposure to the sociable marketplace – transformed into naked capital in which her natural qualities are removed in favour of pure commodification. Her 'male' classical education can never make up for her lack of beauty, because like all women she is defined by her relationship to capital. It is not reading Cicero's *de officiis* which makes men alone suitable for political authority. Eugenia's apparently unique susceptibility to adventurers and fortune hunters reflect women's position as carriers of value on the marriage market. With her smallpox scars compared to the currency used for slaves, women are allied with slaves as carriers of value on the marketplace in what remains a brutal patriarchal economy. Behind the polite spaces of the city, there is only capital, colonisation, and the ever-present promise of popular violence. Indeed, the marketplace is stripped bare of all its pretentions to sociability. Participation leads not just to infection and disfigurement, but indebtedness and psychosis. Camilla's suitor Edgar Mandlebert for example, is counselled by the misogynist Dr Marchmont not to propose instantly to Camilla, but instead to watch each of her behaviours with new vigour. Camilla, baffled by Edgar's distancing becomes ever more indebted as she throws herself into sociable spaces which lead first to estrangement from her family and then to a psychotic breakdown.

Burney thus describes a society in which the spectre of popular violence which Hume so feared is resurgent, both from the Regency Crisis and the French Revolution. Politeness as a social glue, we recall, was dependent on a studied ignorance of confessional and political differences and a sublimation of the violence involved in Protestant hegemony. Sociable spaces were locations in which those who bought the correct clothes and spoke and behaved acceptably were suitably 'British', and thus reinforced Hanoverian claims of moderation. Yet if Cecilia showed the problems of incorporating even a handful of Catholics into these spaces, the influx of emigres proved cataclysmic. The uncomfortable presence of Catholic priests and communities in London and its environs were uncomfortable reminders of England's Catholic population and past, and the popular violence that continued to be enacted against them. What this suggests, then, is that the influx of Catholics to England did not – despite the best efforts of Anglican charitable giving – prove the Protestant liberty of English exceptionalism. Instead, as some English Catholics worried, it threatened to unravel

the delicate status quo.[9] Unable to properly incorporate the emigres in Hanoverian ways of writing history, the mob rises in an inversion of the promises of sociability, bringing with it the ghosts of lost histories. It is no wonder that the defining scene of Camilla is one in which, at the sight of the mob and a corpse, she finds herself unable to write. Politeness and sociability have been shattered, popular violence is a constant threat, the Catholic past is resurgent, and the brute realities of the marketplace and popular violence can no longer be ignored. It is this crisis, of body, history, genre, and text, which brings *Camilla* to its resolution in her first explicit plea for Christian unity.

This chapter is split into two sections. The first outlines the causes for the influx of émigré families into England and tracks the Anglican response. It then moves on to the Burneys' encounter with these families centred on Juniper Hall, in particular Frances' friendship with the set centred on de Stael. Charles Burney's unease with Frances' marriage to a penniless ci-devant aristocrat émigré was based less on hatred of his Catholic faith than longstanding fears for Frances' social standing. Frances' subsequent enduring friendship with the Royal Family however underscores the complex shifting court identities uncovered in the previous chapter. The second section focusses on the novel, combining two broad strands of argument. Firstly, Edgar's close surveillance and Camilla's subsequent breakdown points to Burney's fears that the alternative to the polite identity excoriated in her previous works is complete social breakdown and the return of sectarian violence. Secondly, that Eugenia's disfigurement and wealth reveals – like Cecilia – that polite behaviour is only a thin veneer over a sectarian order based on a marriage market.

As early as July and August 1788, increasing quasi-popular calls – largely through the exiled parlement - for a convening of the estates general came into conflict with King Louis XVI's vacillations.[10] By August 8th, he seemed to have made up his mind: 'the Estates-General would be convened at Versailles on May 1st 1789.'[11] In Grenoble, as elsewhere 'the proclamation was greeted with euphoria' and mass public celebrations. [12] Yet as the months passed, de Brienne – president of the assembly of notables - refused to admit that the calling

[9] Kirsty Carpenter, *Refugees of the French Revolution: Emigres in London, 1789 – 1802* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999), 157.

[10] Simon Schama, *Citizens: A Chronical of the French Revolution* (London: Penguin, 1989), 234-5.
[11] Schama, *Citizens*, 235-6.
[12] Ibid.

of the estates general should mean any the loss of his power and instead attempted to prompt the public to influence the form of the estates-general.[13] Yet in Schama's eyes, it was 'the failure of public credit' which eventually prompted his resignation, and although he managed to briefly forestall the bankruptcy of his administration, it was ultimately 'an attempt to fob off bondholders with paper money' that led to his downfall.[14] The effects of this economic crisis were swift and inextricable from popular violence. A credit crisis that had begun on 16th August 1788 had led within one week to a bank run, the near fall of the government, the resignation of Brienne, and two weeks later to bread riots.[15] This economic violence only intensified as the months passed. July 1789 saw the storming of the bastille, and by mid 1791 the constitutionalist efforts of Mirabeau and Talleyrand had entirely given way to revolutionary violence as the King and Queen failed in their abortive attempts to flee their virtual imprisonment in the Tuileries.[16] It goes without saying that the figure of the hungry mob is key. As Schama has rightly identified, however, the economic failures and the subsequent food riots brought on by the collapse of financial credit are inextricable from the collapse in social credit which brought on the worst of the French Revolution. In other words, economic stability was a necessary glue for social cohesion; once public trust in the ability of the banks to honour credit notes fell, it wasn't long before wider conceptions of identity and loyalty were threatened.[17]

This escalating violence saw a rapid increase in the number of people fleeing France. Schama first points to the religious pressures within France, particularly the threatened withdrawal of clerical stipends for priests who refused to swear an oath to the new constitution and who were consequently blamed for royalist insurrection across the country.[18] Concurrently, the failure of the flight to Varennes had caused a surge in the number of emigrants. Up to a third of the officer corps had fled, and émigré camps created areas where fear of invasion 'were most acute.' In partial response, and after emigres were held responsible for currency speculation, the Assembly ordered that those who had not 'dispersed from what were deemed

[13] Ibid.
[14] Schama, *Citizens,* 237.
[15] Schama, *Citizens,* 238.
[16] Chisholm, *Fanny Burney,* 160-1.
[17] This is of course a materialist reduction, necessarily vague in the necessity of summing up several years of volatile history in a mere handful of paragraphs. One could, of course, raise the question that if public trust in credit notes and bonds was the critical national glue, then surely a public reliance on economic institutions rather than socio-religious loyalty to the king meant that a wider challenging of absolute monarchy was a priori inevitable by the point its foundations had eroded in 1787.
[18] Schama, *Citizens,* 495.

to be armed camps' by 1st January 1792 would 'be declared guilty of conspiracy,' risking death and confiscation of property.[19] This was particularly targeted at the King's sons, and the threat to remove the property of emigres from family members who remained in France would apply even to the royal family. As if those threats were not enough, the prince would be removed from the line of succession if he did not heed the people's call.[20] Emigration, then, was bound up not only with a perceived abandonment of social duty expressed both in the claims of devaluation of the assignats and the increased need for the instability of the old regime, but also with the threat of 'conspiracy', treason, all alongside Louis XVI's somewhat fanciful hopes of a counter-revolutionary invasion.

George's reluctance to stoke Jacobin sentiment in the British Isles stymied any chance of this longed-for intervention. Richard Bourke points out that Edmund Burke had been convinced of the necessity of external assistance to French Royalists by the autumn of 1791, since the anarchy meant 'France no longer existed as a genuinely corporate "people."'[21] Burke's increasing certainty, Bourke argues, has to be seen against a background of British neutrality, with Pitt steadfastly refusing to believe that an anarchic France posed any threat beyond its borders.[22] Yet as the situation deteriorated, with a Prussian advance on Paris, the storming of the Tuileries, and the September Massacres, George's hand was forced as French Armies pushed back the Prussians and marched on Belgium and the Netherlands. Faced with War abroad or Revolution at home, reaction to the National Convention's 19th December edict of 'fraternity and assistance to all peoples seeking to regain their liberty' was muted. Grenville and Pitt urged negotiations in the Hague to a king both sceptical of success and fearful of insurrection.[23] Pitt, then, was right when he set out the sheer terror French victory would bring. The British war against Revolutionary France should be seen as 'a desperate struggle to defend rank, and above all property' against mass pillaging.[24] While it would be ahistorical to call either Burney's terror or the radical upsurge against Pitt a class consciousness per se, E.P Thompson cogently argues that French Revolutionary violence caused the upper-classes to look at the poor and their condition anew.[25] As Burney previously identified, both in her

[19] Schama, *Citizens*, 496.
[20] Schama, *Citizens*, 497.
[21] Richard Bourke, *Empire and Revolution: The Political Life of Edmund Burke* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), 800.
[22] Bourke, *Empire and Revolution*, 801.
[23] Jeremy Black, *George III: America's Last King* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008), 299 – 300.
[24] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707 – 1837* (London: Vintage, 1996), 159.
[25] E.P Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Penguin, 2013), 60 -1

books and at court, the risk of an explicit defence of property as a vanguard against insurrectionary violence risked a wider social breakdown engendered by the proof of Hanoverian precarity. An explicit defence of property and consumer sociability in other words risked proving only the shaky foundations of the King's legitimacy.

The influx of French Catholics in England should not be underestimated. For the lucky few already used to cross-channel mobility, Karen Carpenter notes, 'the transition from aristocrat to émigré was relatively painless,' especially those who fell into the welcoming arms of English Catholic families.[26] Since no official, comprehensive records were kept before the Aliens Bill of 1793 mandated passports, it is difficult to state with any real certainty the number of emigrants to England from France during the worst of the revolution. Paul R. Hanson nevertheless argues for a total of 150,000 'over the course of the revolutionary decade' to myriad destinations including England, with about 25 percent of that number being members of the clergy.[27] Karen Carpenter, meanwhile, suggests anywhere between 10,000 and 40,000 arrivals in Britain between September to December 1792, with an average of 12,500 emigres per year between 1792 and 1802.[28] She later revised this figure to perhaps 30,000 French citizens taking refuge in England, during the revolution itself.[29]

If English Catholic sociability depended on sublimation of their European ties, French Catholic arrivals would have been notable by their foreignness.[30] Particularly important is the new visibility of French Catholic priests. Early episcopal arrivals were 'able to dress according to their rank,' and the sight of 'clerical dress in the London streets created something of a sensation.'[31] Once a number of Catholic Clergy had installed themselves in England, others soon trod what had become a well-established path. Charles Butler, an

[26] Kirsty Carpenter, *Refugees of the French Revolution: Emigres in London, 1789 – 1802* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999), 3.
[27] Paul R. Hanson, 'Emigres', *Historical Dictionary of the French Revolution* (Lanham, Maryland, Toronto, Oxford: The Scarecrow Press, Inc, 2004), 116.
[28] Kirsty Carpenter, 'London: Capital of the Emigration' in Kirsty Carpenter and Philip Mansel, eds, *The French Émigrés in Europe and the Struggle against Revolution, 1789 – 1814* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999), 43 – 67, n2, 61
[29] Kirsty Carpenter, 'Secularization by Stealth? Emigres in Britain during the French Revolution' in Bryan A. Banks and Erica Johnson, eds. *The French Revolution and Religion in Global perspective: Freedom and Faith* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillain, 2017), 73 – 96, 73.
[30] Meanwhile, Samuel Meeke and Elizabeth Meeke had separated, with Samuel remaining in Paris. Macdonald notes that he remained in Paris, working for de Genlis, and attempted – unsuccessfully – to become a member of the Jacobin Club, before 'he appears to have quit France in around 1793.'
Simon Macdonald, 'Identifying Mrs Meeke: Another Burney Family Novelist' *The Review of English Studies*, 64 (2013), 367 – 385, 380.
[31] Carpenter, *Refugees of the French Revolution*, 27.

English Roman Catholic Lawyer, noted how Dorothy Silburn 'unquestionably h[e]ld the first place' among the most useful English individuals, taking first 'The Bishop of St Pol […] in her house' she:

> soon became the central point, to which every Frenchman in distress found his way. […] Where more food, more raiment, more medicine, than the succours afforded, was wanted, it was generally procured by her, or her exertions. Work and labour, she found for those, who sought them. The soothing word, the kind action, never failed her. […] The scenes, thus described by the writer, he himself witnessed.[32]

Mrs Silburn's house 'became known among the clergy as 'La Providence.'[33] This certainly demonstrates the extent to which Catholic woman continued to act as hubs for Catholic unity, not just long past the worst of the sectarian repressions, but across national borders.[34] More troublingly, the French clergy seemed at pains to distinguish themselves from lay emigres and sought to continue their pre-Revolutionary identity as much as possible. While this was no doubt due to an anxiety to minimise disjunction and preserve institutions in the hope of return, the Bishop of St Pol's anxiety that they 'stay away from places and people who might misinterpret their actions' suggests a lingering fear that such acts of preservation might be seen as colonisation or invasion.[35] The London streets had, indeed, changed. The *Catholic Handbook* of 1796 noted how 'the sulpicians of Montreal sent to the Abbé Bourret' enough money to begin building a new Chapel at King Street, where priests 'and sometimes Princes of the Royal House of France [were] busily employed helping the workmen.'[36] This does not just suggest the continuation of Catholic networks post-revolution, but also that the spectacle of French Catholicism began to alter an urban landscape that had, until recently, been predicated on the occlusion of its enduring Catholic materiality.[37]

---

[32] Charles Butler, *The Philological and Biographical works of Charles Butler, esquire, of Lincoln's Inn, in five volumes: Volume V: Containing Church of France* (London: Printed for W. Clarke and Sons, Portugal Street, Lincoln's Inn, 1817), 263.
[33] Carpenter, *Refugees of the French Revolution,* 28; An exploration of how the Protestant landscape of London changed in the eyes of its inhabitants is, alas, beyond the scope of this study.
[34] Jan Broadway 'Agnes Throckmorton: a Jacobean Recusant Widow' in Peter Marshal and Geoffrey Scott (eds) *Catholic Gentry in English Society: the Throckmortons of Coughton from Reformation to Emancipation* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2008), 123 – 143, 123 - 4.
[35] Carpenter, 'Secularization by stealth?', 82.
[36] Johanna H. Harting, *Catholic London Missions,* (London: Sand & Co, 1903), 231-2.
[37] Indeed, David Rice points out that this chapel served the needs of 'eight French princes of the blood and twelve French bishops.' David Rice, 'Combine Against the Devil: The Anglican Church and the French Refugee Clergy in the French Revolution', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, Vol. 50, No. 3 (September, 1981). 271-281, 271-2.

At first the Anglican response to the influx was both overwhelmingly positive. 'Private individuals' across the social scale worked to support émigré Catholics, with elite lodging mirrored by 'small acts of generosity' by, for example, the Twining family – close friends of Charles.[38] David Rice's examples suggest that the influx of Catholic refugees provided an excellent opportunity to demonstrate the quintessential Anglican duty of charity to the less fortunate.[39] Indeed, its religious and nationalist characteristic here is perhaps best encapsulated by George III's instruction for each parish to hold a collection for the relief of the French Clergy. A letter from John Moore, the Archbishop of Canterbury to the suffragan bishops spoke of how the Catholic priests 'sufferers alone for conscience sake, were driven into our dominions without any means of livelihood or support.'[40] In raising 'conscience sake' of course, Moore also raises the spectre of England's own religious wars during the reformation, and – some attempts by parishes to convert their guests aside[41] - appears to signal a novel ecumenicism of Christianity in the face of Jacobinism.[42]

Yet the presence of French Catholics in London threatened to exacerbate a tension between Catholics who took advantage of sociability and those, overwhelmingly in the north of England, who tended towards Conservative isolationism. These English Catholics felt 'threatened by the intrusion of these mainstream European Catholics into a delicate national situation.'[43] In the wake of the introduction of the oath of allegiance as part of the Papists Act of 1778, 'two separate traditions in the English Catholic community' became more visible, with the pietist, Challoner-led Ultramontane 'garden of the soul' tradition opposed by the Cisalpines who, led by Joseph Berington and Charles Butler, 'dominated the Catholic committee' and were keen ignore the political claims of the papacy.[44] The meaning of

[38] Rice, 'Combine against the Devil', 273.
[39] See the argument in Chapter Two.
[40] 'A letter from John, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury to the Suffragan bishops of the Province of Canterbury; to cause a public collection of charity to be made for the relief of the French clergy, refugees in the British dominions'. 24 April 1793, *John Moore Papers*, Dissenters, 8. 1782 – 1805 Lambeth Palace Library, ff. 128-130.
[41] Rice, 'Combined against the Devil,' 274.
[42] Granville Sharpe, writing in 'Some memorandums concerning the Gallican Branch of the Catholic Church of Christ' disputes the Catholicism of the Roman Catholic church due to the ultramontane claims of the Pope. The 'true Catholic church,' for Greville is one that permits the state to appoint its own bishops. In this instance then, alongside arguing that the Pope is in apostasy against the church for usurping episcopal power in the fifth century, Sharpe argues that the restored French Church should become more Catholic by modelling itself on the Anglican church. Granville Sharpe, in 'Some memorandums concerning the Gallican Branch of the Catholic Church of Christ' 25th July *John Moore Papers*, Dissenters, 8. 1782 – 1805, Lambeth Palace Library, ff. 175-182.
[43] Carpenter, *Refugees*, 157.
[44] Robert Hole, *Pulpits, Politics, and Public Order 1760 – 1832* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).105

'papist' was a key struggle, not just between militant Protestants and their myriad opponents, but between Cisalpine and Ultramontane camps. While Cisalpines sought to prove the Englishness of their Catholicism, both Ultramontane and Protestant polemicists asserted the Pope's claims to political authority. As the anonymous *Appeal from the Protestant Association* argued in 1779, once a papist had power 'it must be used to spread and exalt Popery […] England will again be deluged with the blood of martyrs, our liberties be exchanged for bondage.'[45] Catholic writers such as Simon Berington railed against their 'the odious name of papists.'[46] While the Ultramontanes attempted to prove Cisalpines 'were only an insignificant unofficial minority of the Catholic body', by setting up a Roman Catholic Club in London, 'the real strength of orthodoxy' remained in the north, and the Club lasted only from 1793 to 1797.[47] This underscores the fragility of Hanoverian claims to hegemony over the nation. It is no wonder that Catholics close to the fashionable centres in the south sought to emphasise their loyalty, as minimising religious difference offered a degree of sociability and participation in the affairs of the nation. It remains to be seen whether Catholics further from the capital held stronger links to the continent than those whose social networks brought them to London. What this does indicate however is that Hanoverian sociability was more likely to be a southern and urban, and therefore ever-more fragile phenomena at constant risk of incursion.

As the English Catholics feared, the French Catholic communities soon began to find themselves entwined with factions in court and parliament. This is particularly evident when religious communities began to relocate, with Mrs Fitzherbert using 'the Prince of Wales' own carriage […] for the use of the prioress' when the '37 nuns from the convent at Montargis' relocated to Shoreham in 1792. 'They created quite a spectacle and the beach was reported to be 'a mass of people' curious to see them.'[48] The presence of the Prince of Wales' carriage signalled the Catholics' arrival into the domestic political scene. Maria Fitzherbert had secretly married the Prince of Wales in 1785, but her Catholicism and George III's lack of consent meant that it would have been annulled both under the Act of Settlement of 1701 and the Royal Marriages Act of 1772.[49] Born into a gentry Catholic family, and educated by

[45] Anon, *An appeal from the Protestant Association to the People of Great Britain Concerning the Probable Tendency of the Late Act of Parliament in Favour of the Papists* (London: J.W Pasham, 1779), 52.
[46] Simon Berington, *A Modest Inquiry How Far Catholicks are Guilty of the Horrid Tenets Laid to Their Charge* (London: 1749), 4 – 5.
[47] J.C.H. Aveling, *The Handle and the Ax* (Colchester: Bondd and Briggs, 1976), 334.
[48] Carpenter, *Refugees,* 31.
[49] Black, *George III,* 153.

the 'Blue Nuns' in Paris, she married twice.[50] Her first husband died within a year, and the second within three 'in consequence of his exertions during Lord George Gordon's Riots, by bathing whilst he was heated.'[51] At first, the royal family were able to look the other way to talk of marriage, though they acknowledged their relationship had a heretofore unknown domesticity.[52] Nevertheless, by 1787 the rumours had reached the House of Commons as part of negotiations over the relief of the Prince's debts.[53] Charles James Fox promptly denied the marriage.[54] Mrs Fitzherbert, however, having read the report in the papers, forced the Prince to send Sheridan to contradict Fox.[55] Although the relationship would fall apart in 1794 – 5,[56] the trouble was enough to influence George III's refusal to permit Catholic emancipation and thereby force Pitt's resignation.[57] In this context, then, the foreign Catholics were, in the eyes of the English cisalpine southerners at least, inextricably bound up with the Whiggish political faction and their presence threatened to inflame contemporary sectarian violence.

Meanwhile, Burney's experience at court appears to have improved her confidence. First sundered from the Queen, then forced to share with her sister her father's book-strewn apartments at Chelsea College, Burney soon 'allowed herself to be virtually adopted by the conduct-book writer Mrs Ord.'[58] They soon set off on a tour of the country. In the first two weeks of August, they saw 'Farnham, Winchester, Salisbury, and Dorchester.'[59] Then after a week in Sidmouth, they moved on to via 'Exeter, Bridgwater, Glastonbury, Wells and on to Bath,' where they lingered for three weeks. Here Burney met the Dowager Lady Spencer, and her daughters – among them the Duchess of Devonshire.[60] Mrs Ord was repulsed at 'this high

[50] Robert Bracey, 'Mrs Fitzherbert,' *Blackfriars,* Vol. 20, No. 237 (December 1939),. 855-860, 855-6
[51] Anon, review of 'Memoirs of Mrs. Fitzherbert, by the Hon Charles Langdale Bently London, 1856, in *The Rambler: A Catholic Journal and Review,* New Series: Vol. 5, (London: Burns and Lambert, 1856), 352 -370, 355
[52] Janice Hadlow, *The Strangest Family: The Private Lives of George III, Queen Charlotte, and the Hanoverians* (London: William Collins, 2014), 447 – 8.
[53] Ibid.
[54] William Hague, *William Pitt the Younger* (London: Harper, 2005), 237,
[55] Bracey, 'Mrs Fitzherbert', 858.
[56]

> 'Meanwhile, the Prince of Wales had abandoned Maria Fitzherbert, his wife by clandestine marriage, and by mid-1794 become devoted to Frances, countess of Jersey. He then had the audacity to appoint her Princess Caroline's [whom he had married in 1795] first lady of the bedchamber. By 1796, sordid details of the Wales breakup filled the newspapers.
> Marilyn Morris, 'The Royal Family and Family Values in Late Eighteenth-Century England' *Journal of Family History,* vol 21, no. 4, Oct 1996, 519 – 532, 521

[57] Aveling, *The Handle and the Ax,* 257.
[58] Kate Chisholm, *Fanny Burney: Her Life* (London: Vintage, 1998), 160-1.
[59] Joyce Hemlow, *The History of Fanny Burney* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), 223.
[60] Ibid.

acquaintance among the Whig aristocracy, friends of the Prince Regent' whose 'private lives […] could so little bear examination.' Yet despite Mrs Ord's horror, it was her own friendship with Lady Spencer which led to Burney's introduction to Georgiana at Bath.[61] At first, Burney was suspicious; the circle had a moral taint, and her father certainly would not have approved.[62] But after a day or so she pronounced Georgiana 'one of the most pleasant people I have ever met.'[63] Frances therefore 'would never […] make over into Mrs Ord's custody and management her opinion of the world,' and was content to 'speak loyally and gratefully of the court' to her new friends.[64] The journey and friendship promised a reintroduction to society after five years at court. But her ability to reject Ord's advice points to a newfound confidence in the ability to judge the limits of propriety. Despite being bound monetarily and emotionally to the court then, she is nevertheless able to create social connections which, one feels, would have been impossible as a younger woman.

Indeed, Burney refused to be questioned on her private sympathies. She was grateful that Mrs Ord paid careful attention to her health. That is 'corporeal ones, I mean – the *mental*, [I have] no intention to commit to such close investigation.'[65] She was prepared to speak her mind and defend her inclinations. At Winchester Inn, they met a large group of emigres whose flight 'from à la lanterne [sic]' was complicated by each Inn being filled by spectators eager to see the latest public executions:

> After a little deliberation, we now were touched to shake off a part of the John Bullism that had encrusted us, and to ask them to our sitting Room, to drink Tea: though a little still clung to us, in our debate which should be excused from making them the proposal.[66]

They 'ended the contest' by having a waiter take the invitation. It was well received, and a 'shower of French was poured upon' them in thanks and cordiality, along with a long

---

[61] Amanda Foreman, *Georgiana: Duchess of Devonshire* (London: Flamingo, 1999), 256.
[62] Georgiana is unfortunately best well-known for her campaigning for, and whispered affair with, Charles James Fox. (Foreman, xiv) But the family too had its wider scandals:

> Fanny was shocked by Lady Spencer's reference to Harriet's principles: she knew what everyone in London knew – that Harriet had never been faithful to Duncannon, that she had had an affair with Sheridan, and that Duncannon was delaying a divorce until his father died 'lest the grief of such an event should shorten his days.' Foreman, *Georgiana,* 257.

[63] Foreman, *Georgiana,* 258.
[64] Hemlow, *The History…*, 224.
[65] Frances Burney to Charles Burney, 13 August 1791, Peter Sabor and Lars E. Troide, eds. *Frances Burney: Journals and Letters* (London: Penguin, 2001), 336 – 339, 336 Hereon JL.
[66] Ibid, 336 - 7

explanation of their travails and condition in France. Burney is too polite to be explicit about Mrs Ord's xenophobia. Nevertheless, her disgust at Georgiana's circle suggests it was Ord, and not Burney, whose reluctance was predominant. Sharing this material and cultural ritual, Ord fears, risks contaminating her own identity. There was, as Burney states, some 'encrusted John Bullism' here among 'us', but it sticks most tenaciously to Ord. This is of course salient in its fluent yet implicit defence of the cosmopolitanism of her family's youth, against the reactionary forces for whom Mrs Ord acts as a mouthpiece. Just as her years at court have crystallised her devotion to the royal family's bodies so too have they made the pressures of performance a comparative trifle.

The letter in which Burney discusses her meeting with the émigrés rewrites Madame Duval's introduction outside the theatre in *Evelina.* The party:

> had been to see the Fleet, in hopes it was sailing to the relief of their pauvre Roi. I assured them I wished their pauvre Roi every other good, most cordially; but not that of involving a National War. They had been in England two months. One of the ladies spoke English tolerably […] The other lady seemed exactly a French Character drawn by an English Author. She was characteristically National in the highest degree.[67]

Burney gives us a Captain and Mrs Mirvan figure in one: Mrs Ord constantly surveys her for any signs of an illness which, after George's illness, hints at a dangerous unmaking of national identity. Burney, however, does her best to keep her mental health to herself, concurrently splitting her identity between public and private personas. Burney's trip with Mrs Ord is less a question of rejuvenation and more a long test to ensure she is ready to perform Britishness on a wider stage, and that she has not caught anything from the King. Here, however, Burney's harsh lessons on corporeal control at court serve her well. In response to Mrs Ord's Mirvan-esque reluctance to help the strange women, she writes an intertextual letter to both her father and to her younger self. Here, for example, is the Monsieur Duval-esque threat of a capital punishment from the 'Judges' and their sentences, and a French party arrived wholly alone amongst xenophobic townspeople. There is even, and Burney could not have written this without a smile, a lady who 'seemed exactly a French Character drawn by an English Author.'

[67] Frances Burney to Charles Burney, 13 August 1791, Peter Sabor and Lars E. Troide, eds. *Frances Burney: Journals and Letters* (London: Penguin, 2001), 336 – 339, 337-8.

The presence of the people signals the breakdown not just of polite spaces, but of the 'records' of property and history. The 'French Character […] bewailed the situation of her King and party with an emotion that almost made her sob as she spoke' of the situation in France, where only 'the reigning party' were safe:

> the gift of liberty to the people, had annihilated common security for *les honnettes gens*, if their principles were even suspected to be opposite to those of the national assembly: – All, she said, was confusion and horror, except for the Democrats: - and even their country houses, whither they were wont to retire, when distressed, disturbed, or wearied at Paris, could now afford them no shelter, as the humour of *le peuple* must not be controverted; and if they were seized with a desire to enter any villa, and turn out its inhabitants, and burn all their records and property, they must neither be stopt nor punished, till their mischief was done.[68]

This is the voice of someone who has herself experienced the 'humour of *le peuple*' during the Gordon Riots. Nevertheless, Julia Epstein reminds us that we should resist the urge to read Burney's letters and journals as 'transcripts of actual life', instead paying attention to the 'ironic manipulations of narrative voice.' [69] In this spirit, we must see the ironic nod to the 'french character' as another direction to her family that this must not be read as an objective account. Indeed, this letter reveals the conflicted response by Burney to the events in France.[70] Burney is sympathetic to the 'democrats', evincing sympathy for the 'pauvre roi' yet desirous to avoid English involvement in a civil war to restore Bourbon authority. Paralysis in the face of popular violence, the hallmark of Evelina and Cecilia's responses to trauma are still present here. The account of the 'confusion and horror' of mob rule, the sacking of 'country houses' and destruction of 'records and property' do not mark a freedom from the impositions of sociable identity, but instead an anarchic anti-history in which the incursion of *le peuple* marks a terror worse than anything the court offered.

One of community of émigrés was particularly well linked to the Whig establishment and to the extended Burney family. In September 1792, Susan wrote to Frances from Mickleham that a handful of families were to rent Juniper Hall, and another had been able to let Westhumble only after the Christian-like supposition that, 'being nothing but French

[68] Ibid, 338.
[69] Julia Epstein, *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing* (Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 27.
[70] Although Chisholm notes that she followed her father's approval of Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, Chisholm, *Fanny Burney*, 161.

Papishes, they would never pay' had been assuaged by the Burney's friend Mr Locke underwriting of their rent.[71] Susan was keen to give the emigres as hearty a welcome as she could. Not only was she horrified to hear how the son of one 'Madame de Broglie', younger than her own son, had been forced to spend fourteen hours in an open boat while crossing the channel, but clearly 'knew how they were likely to be treated on John Bull's island.'[72] The extended Burney family again display their eagerness to help their fellow Christians and scepticism of Anglican 'Christians' who slander their Catholic brothers and sisters. But the eagerness of these Anglicans to incorporate the Catholic emigres into their neighbourhood networks does not just point to the importance of such kinship relations over and above ecumenical or national squabbles, but in their eagerness the potential for wider tensions between the emigres and their new neighbours.

Yet there were other reasons why the Juniper Hall set might be uneasy about their reception in England. Simon Schama notes that the turmoil of 1789-90 saw the fragmentation of class and social solidarity, with a split among former members of the Society of Thirty and its successor, the "Breton Club" at Versailles.[73] One group packed the membership of the 'Society of Friends,' (i.e the Jacobins) while the other – among them Mirabeau, Sieyes, and Talleyrand – formed The Club of 1789.[74] While the Jacobins sought a wide, popular membership and democratic radicalism to protect the constitution, the Club saw the danger coming from anarchy and state bankruptcy and the Jacobins inevitably viewed the 1789ers as Royalist plotters.[75] It was this group and their friends which formed the nexus of the Juniper Hall set.[76] As Schama suggests, Surrey society was split between those who were fascinated or scandalized by the salonnieres' presence. Yet it was not just the rumour of scandal that surrounded de Stael. While one of the main reasons the Lockes had befriended the emigres was their support for the 1791 constitution, yet with France slipping into anarchy they were now blamed by many in England – Dr Burney among them – for their contribution to the present chaos.[77] Moreover, via de Stael, Juniper Hall became a key point of contact between

[71] Constance Hill, *Juniper Hall* (London and New York: John Lane, 1904), 37.
[72] Hemlow, *The History*, 226.
[73] Schama, *Citizens*, 407.
[74] Ibid.
[75] Ibid.
[76] Schama, *Citizens*, 577.
[77] Hester Davenport, *Faithful Handmaid: Fanny Burney at the Court of George 3rd* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2000), 164.

liberal monarchists and key figures in the British Whig opposition.[78] It's little surprise, then, that growing suspicion not only lead local soldiers to refuse the offer of a drink from the friendly emigres for fear of being poisoned,[79] but to the more than plausible allegation that the Hall was being kept under surveillance by government agents.[80] Fears of revolutionary spies amongst the emigres were as strong in Britain as the fear of counter-revolutionary agents amongst returning emigres were in France. Juniper Hall must therefore be seen not just as a site of refuge, but also as a porous space that – just like Mr Delvile's hall – threatens Protestant claims on English land in its Franco-British materiality. Just as it demonstrated the potentiality of French Catholics to integrate into a virtuous British society – the hall is neither wholly British, nor wholly French, it points to the fragility of cultural claims over the landscape on its occupiers.

The fragility of British national identity was only further underscored by the uncertain nationalities of the émigrés. Renaud Morieux argues that '[w]ith the French Revolution, symbolic, juridical, and political frontiers between nations and states began to converge.'[81] Passage between France and England began to be formalised and restricted. Yet the fear here was not just of simple emigration and invasion, but of the need to define membership of a nation state. '[T[he concept of 'alien' does not have the same meaning in France and Britain,' with 'emigres, priests, and aristocrats […] considered foreigners, meaning enemies of the revolution.'[82] As Morieux goes on to suggest in *The Channel,* the anxiety over where a nation state ended and where it began – and who exactly would arbitrate in disputes, government or cross-channel contacts – forces us to acknowledge that there was nothing simple about

[78] Doina Pasca Harsanyi, *Lessons from America: Liberal French Nobles in Exile, 1793-1798* (State Park, PA: Pennsylvania University Press, 2010), 51.
[79] Janice Farrar Thaddeus, *Frances Burney: A Literary Life* (Basingstoke: MacMillan, 2000), 217.
[80] Kate Chisholm suggests that an English tutor by the name of William Clark, employed by the set may have been the same William Clark who submitted a report to the government on Madame de Genlis and her friends in Bury St. Edmunds. Chisholm, *Fanny Burney,* 168;

Meanwhile, David Lawday notes Pitt's personal expulsion of Talleyrand under the Alien Bill of 1793 as evidence that the British Government feared the Constitutionalists would provoke similar violence in England. Talleyrand wrote that he believed ultra-royalist emigres were responsible, but also suggested to de Stael that the Austrian and Prussian courts had been behind Pitt's actions, 'which suggested he wasn't unaware of spying allegations laid against him.' David Lawday, *Napoleons's Master: A Life of Prince Talleyrand* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2006), 72. See also J.R Dinwiddy, *Radicalism and Reform in Britain, 1780 – 1850* (London and Rio Grande, The Hambledon Press, 1992), 152.
[81] Renaud Morieux, '"An Inundation From Our Shores": Travelling Across the Channel Around the Peace of Amiens', Mark Philp, ed., *Resisting Napoleon: The British Response to the Threat of Invasion* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 217 – 240, 217.
[82] Morieux, 'An Inundation…' 219.

national identity, 'nor was it objectively constructed by law.'[83] In the context of our emigres, then, their repudiation under the laws mandating return in 1792 problematises their French identity. Indeed, if their Frenchness is dependent on their relationship to a hierarchical state rather than a set of naturalised cultural and behavioural norms, then the destruction of that state and execution of its head makes them worse than stateless. This is clearly paradoxical. For the English, they are French; but for the French, they are foreign conspirators. How they defined themselves is unclear. But they are emigres from a country that no longer exists. Worse, they are nebulously Catholic in this universal statelessness. Members of a stateless nation, they become ever more allied to a pan-European Catholic identity in the eyes of their hosts.

In this stateless Catholic milieu Frances met her husband. Frances first met the exiles shortly before the execution of the King in late January 1793, when she first went to stay at Norbury Park. Yet before then she had been alerted by Susan to 'the open and manly General d'Arblay,' 'on guard with Liancourt' during the flight to Varennes, second in command to Lafayette in the Austrian war, who had arrived with 'Narbonne some time in November,' after escaping capture by revolutionary solders 'with nothing but the money in his pocket and a bag full of clothes.' [84] Her first mention of d'Arblay to her father was in a letter of 28th January, in which she described him and Narbonne as 'two of the most accomplished and elegant men I ever saw.'[85] Their relationship soon intensified. Yet the fact that she goes out of her way to indicate Narbonne and d'Arblay's shame at 'their guiltless birth in that guilty country' points to Burney's awareness of the uncertainty surrounding d'Arblay's threat, loyalties, and nationality. [86] Frances' system of government was 'guilty', but the fact of their birth or faith in France was 'guiltless.' Frances' presence here was therefore dangerously uncertain.[87] That she felt confident enough to associate not only with Catholics, but with French Catholics who were blamed for the anarchy and suspected of fomenting Jacobite violence in Britain speaks to the boost in confidence in Burney since the quiet radicalism of

[83] Renaud Morieux, *The Channel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 328-9.
[84] Chisholm, *Fanny Burney*, 163; Harman suggests d'Arblay was probably ignorant of the escape to Varennes, and if the King had not been recaptured he would almost certainly have been executed. Claire Harman, *Fanny Burney: A Biography* (London: Flamingo, 2000), 232
[85]Journal letter, Frances Burney to Charles Burney, 28th January 1793, Peter Sabor and Lars E. Troide, eds. *Frances Burney: Journals and Letters* (London: Penguin, 2001), 354 – 355, 355.
[86] Ibid.
[87] Indeed, with Juniper Hall uncertain in its relationship to the land outside, her very presence in the hall – as Mrs Ord understood hesitating over accepting tea with the strangers – could have led to pervasive suspicions amongst the more nationalistic Britons.

Evelina. While her vibrant defence of Catholicism may have been present from an early age, it took her until the age of forty to feel confident enough to express it.

Alexandre and Frances' courtship moreover rested upon a fundamental creative equality. Firstly, 'by the end of the second week of their acquaintance' he 'insisted' that he tutor her in French, though as Harman notes Burney already knew French well and only spoke it little due to shyness.[88] Secondly, as Peter Sabor notes, d'Arblay was an accomplished amenuensis and poet who had much to discuss with Frances.[89] d'Arblay was probably wise to use a pseudonym for *Opuscules de Chevalier d'Anceny.* One of the poems therein, Les Doigts à Rosine 'is a frank, sensual, and hilarious paen to the joys of masturbation.'[90] Critical here, however, is the extent to which Burney and d'Arblay saw their partnership as a meeting of equals. In their letters in English (d'Arblay) and French (Burney), she referred to him as 'mon maitre' and he to her as his 'master in gown,' while due to his political and financial powerlessness, 'she was the provider, trying to find tactful ways of lending d'Arblay some money.' [91] As Harman argues, Frances' 'strong feelings' for d'Arblay amplified her fondness for the society of Juniper Hall. Indeed, she admitted to Mrs Locke it was 'something like Juniper Fever' that caused her to keep 'exposing myself to the wrath of John Bull when this coterie come in competition.'[92] John Bull is here contrasted to the possibilities of pan-European exchange. Yet if the hall's uncertain territoriality unsettled 'John Bull', it offered a radical space in which Catholic and Anglican could meet on equal terms. Neither British nor French, neither autocratic monarchist nor Jacobin, the émigré community promised a space free of the frameworks which ensnared Frances' heroines and complicated their marriages.

[88] Harman, *Fanny Burney*, 235

[89] Peter Sabor, '"Altered, improved, copied, abridged": Alexandre d'Arblay's Revisions to Burney's *Edwy and Elgiva'*, *Lumen*, 14, 127 – 137:

> He had recently demonstrated his capacities as a copyist by transcribing parts of Madame de Stael's De l'influence des passions in May 1793. […] in only six months in 1796, for example, he made two fair copies of Burney's longest novel, *Camilla*. […]. Before being forced to flee from France in 1792 as a Constitutionalist he had published a collection of occasional poems, as well as two pamphlets concerning a feud between members of the Garde nationale.8 In publishing his poetry he concealed his identity beneath a double disguise: attributing the verses to a pseudonymous 'Chevalier d'Anceny / under the editorship of 'M. d'A***.' His self-effacement resembles that of Burney, who had taken great pains to conceal her authorship of *Evelina* (1778), and who would never acknowledge authorship of most of her plays

[90] Thaddeus, *Frances Burney*, 111-2.

[91] Doody, *Frances Burney*, 200, 202.

[92] Harman, *Fanny Burney*, 236-7.

This pan-European milieu still brought moral risks. Burney's reputation preceded her, and points to her fame throughout Europe. d'Arblay's former roommate was Choderlos de Laclos, author of *Les Liaisons Dangereuse* (a character in which was named after d'Arblay's pen name for his aforementioned book of erotic poetry). [93] In Laclos' 7,000 word review of *Cecilia* in 1784, he argues that Burney's second novel ranks as one of the greatest works of modern European literature. Also among the Juniper Hall set was Madame de Stael. De Stael had read *Cecilia* (1782) 'probably in 1792, before her departure for England,' and so was more than familiar with Burney and her reputation before Frances' arrival in Mickleham.[94] The two soon developed a firm friendship, and as with d'Arblay, they 'planned to study French and English together.'[95] At first her letters and essays to d'Arblay were focussed on her new friend, whom 'she was strongly drawn to as a woman very like Mrs Thrale.'[96] Yet when de Stael invited Frances to join the community on a more permanent basis, Frances was rebuffed by her father – terrified about (correct) gossip among the London literary scene on which his patronage dependent, that de Stael had abandoned her husband and fathered an illegitimate child with Narbonne.[97] Charles' command, spurred on by horrified letters from Mrs Ord and the Burkes, was that Frances should immediately break off all communication.[98] Frances replied with a spirited defence of the Constitutionalists against the Jacobins and 'corrupt noblesse alike.'[99] Yet this does not just reflect her newfound confidence in the possibility of forging a literary identity free from moral suspicion. Nor does it reveal, as Harman suggests, Burney's fundamental naivety at the possibility of adultery, homosexuality, or even lying.[100] Her defence of de Stael came instead from a deeper understanding of the pressures of womanhood in the eighteenth century. This is not to say that she condoned de Stael's behaviour. She followed her father's advice and ceased contact. Frances' resistance however does point to a confidence in expression rather than reflexive capitulation.

Charles' disapproval of Alexandre however, was not enough to interrupt his marriage to Frances. Rather than anti-Catholicism, it was the more practical consideration of money and politics which worried him. Frances' pension of £100 was not only 'barely enough to live

[93] Brian McCrea, *Frances Burney and Narrative Prior to Ideology* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013), 117.
[94] Angelica Goodden, *Madame de Stael: The Dangerous Exile* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 43.
[95] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 199
[96] Chisholm, *Fanny Burney,* 166.
[97] Ibid.
[98] Hemlow, *Fanny Burney,* 23.
[99] Harman, *Fanny Burney,* 237.
[100] Harman, *Fanny Burney,* 237-8.

on', but depended on the Queen's humour; Charles' first coldness towards Alexandre only softened after the latter had written 'a comprehensive analysis of all the factions in France,' which ended by lauding the 'constitution Anglaise [as] the model of just and fair government.'[101] The next time Alexandre called, he was invited into Charles' library, where 'the two men found common cause in their mutual love of French and Italian poetry.' Yet Charles was still concerned that Alexandre had no means of supporting Frances should the Queen withdraw her pension.[102] While Charles did not attempt to stop it, he refused to socially sanction the marriage. Giving only 'a cold acquiescence' and composing none of the celebratory verses or minuets his other daughters received, it fell to her brother James to 'gave the forty-one year old bride away' on 28th July 1793.[103] They were married first at the parish church at Mickleham, followed by a Catholic ceremony two days later in London at the chapel of the Sardinian Ambassador.'[104] Frances' marriage to Alexandre and her subsequent connection to the émigré community of ci-devants marks a particular crisis for the Burney family's balancing of Catholic Europe and Protestant Britain. If we accept that Charles' obsession over the past decades had been the consolidation of a precarious social status predicated on Catholic culture, then his daughter's marriage threatened to unravel this labour. Marriage to a Catholic, as Frances' letters to Mrs Thrale demonstrated, risked a conversion that Charles' had long feared. In turn, his refusal to mark the marriage creatively points to the fear hinted at the preface to his travelogue in which he sought to reinvigorate English music without converting the country. Charles had fully bought in to the discourses of politeness and consumer sociability which would be threatened by the possibility present in Juniper Hall of a deeper reconciliation between England's frayed historical threads.

Charles however softened immediately after the marriage. It surely helped that fears of his daughter's penury, social isolation, and conversion proved unfounded. The Jacobinism of the French Revolution seems to have made explicit Catholicism more acceptable. Alongside

---

[101] Chisholm, *Fanny Burney,* 170.

[102] Frances herself acknowledged the pecuniary source of her father's withholding of his blessing in a letter to Georgiana Waddington on the 2nd August 1793.

> You may be amazed not to see the name of my dear father upon this solemn occasion: but his apprehensions from the smallness of our income have made him cold and averse – and though he granted his consent, I could not even solicit his presence.

Frances Burney d'Arblay to Georgiana Waddington, 2nd August 1793, *JL. 366 – 9, 367-8.*
See also Frances' handwritten note, whereby she cites 'my intended marriage, which my dear father was rather averse, though not prohibitory, from apprehensions of pecuniary misery.' Charlotte to Frances Burney d'Arblay, July 27th 1793, Egerton MS. 3693, British Library.

[103] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 202.

[104] Ibid.

letters from her father, 'the Burkes, [and] Queeney Thrale,' there was also the much-anticipated sanction from the Queen – a delight tempered only by the ostracism of Mrs Ord.[105] Not even the Royal Family's sanction was enough for Mrs Ord to regard the marriage as permissible. With Ord's world view so utterly predicated on subservience to the Church and King, this would suggest what the King's illness had a wide-ranging effect on Royal authority even after his first recovery, leading to the most hard-line defendants of Anglican supremacy becoming more Hanoverian than the Hanoverians. Why, then, was Frances' marriage to Alexandre permissible while Mrs Thrale's remarriage faced widespread ostracism? The answer in part would appear to be the difference in social station between the teacher Piozzi and the ci-devant d'Arblay. An ageing spinster marrying a French ci-devant, whose constitutionalism was predicated on fondness for 1688 and limited monarchy would have been more acceptable than a widow re-marrying outside her country, faith, and class. Such a marriage, as Frances had shuddered, had less to do with social necessity and more with satisfying desire. Yet it also points to a wider shift in the post-Revolutionary landscape as the nature of the French threat mutated from Catholicism to Atheism.

Indeed, the Anglican Church saw new possibilities among the émigré clergy. 1793 saw Charles make extended visits to the Burkes at Beaconsfield, where he attempted to make substantive progress on his biography of the Italian poet and librettist Metastasio. Burke encouraged his biography. Yet when he 'accepted an invitation from Mrs Crewe's brother, who had recently married the eldest daughter of the Duke of Portland, to visit Bulstrode,' it was 'soon laid aside late in the summer when the opportunity of practical assistance to the victims of the French Revolution presented itself.' [106] Mrs Crewe had been visiting Eastbourne when she was moved by the sight of a large crowd of French Clergy, reduced to 'beggary with silent resignation' to 'raise money among her female friends to supplement the tiny allowance' from the government.[107] Though Charles enjoyed the work as Mrs Crew's 'London agent,' and his official correspondence with Burke and Windham, he found his role snowball into a near full-time occupation, and his daughter 'persuaded to write a dignified pamphlet in support of it,' in order to change 'male opinion' that it was mere 'Lady's nonsense.'[108] Not surprisingly, the unpaid work quickly overwhelmed Charles. Even Mrs

[105] Hemlow, *The History of Fanny Burney*, 240.
[106] Roger Lonsdale, *Dr Charles Burney: A Literary Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), 366.
[107] Charles Burney to Frances Burney, 12th September 1793, Egerton MS. 3690, British Library.
[108] Ibid.

Crewe was 'alarmed at the demands he was making on himself,' though Lonsdale notes that this concern did not extend to arranging any help beyond expressing a nebulous sympathy and assuming he'd get on with it. To nobody's surprise, Charles worked himself to the point of a nervous breakdown and a series of crippling rheumatic attacks. Though he eventually recovered some months later, the use of his hands was still limited. Key here is Lady Crewe and Charles' belief that Frances could argue ecumenical charity was 'dignified' and not mere 'lady's nonsense.' Frances' ability to engage with the problems of charity and their relationship to faith and gender was therefore well-known within the extended family. This supports this thesis' reading of her books as philosophical engagements with the Anglican state. Frances' voice moreover could speak outside the sphere of 'Lady's nonsense', adding further proof that her work was not just seen as 'novel writing' but as a mature and comparable political voice. The fact that Mrs Crewe went first to Charles, who then went to his daughter, also places the Burney family both at the critical centre of polite establishment literary production and underscores how Frances' celebrity was considered to be a family possession. Consequently, Charles seems justified in linking the family's literary reputation to moral spotlessness.

Frances' voice continued to carry considerable authority. Margaret Anne Doody notes that Frances' authorial personality was at the core of the pamphlet, with the title page 'announcing the pamphlet as "By the author of Evelina and Cecilia.'[109] Unsurprisingly given Mrs Crewe's focus on a female circle of subscribers, Burney's preface 'apology' focusses on the difficulties of publishing as a woman. Yet while acknowledging that she may be straying 'from the allotted boundaries and appointed province of females' in this 'interference in public matters,' she nevertheless argues that women are uniquely positioned to engage in public moral correction.[110] As such, lamenting the poverty of the Catholic priests, she points to the resource of 'FEMALE BENEFICENCE':

> Already a considerable number of Ladies have stept forward for this Christian purpose. Their plan has been printed and dispersed. It speaks equally to the heart and to the understanding; it points out wretchedness which we cannot dispute, and methods for the relief of which we cannot deny the feasibility. The ladies who have initiated this scheme desire not to be named; and those who are the principal agents for putting it in execution, join in the same with. Such delicacy is too respectable to

[109] Doody, *Frances Burney*, 203.
[110] Frances Burney, *Brief Reflections Relative to the Emigrant French Clergy, Earnestly Submitted to the Humane Consideration of the Ladies of Great Britain* (London: Thomas Cadell, 1793), IV.

> be opposed and ostentation is unnecessary to promulgate what modest silence may recommend to higher purposes. [111]

Nevertheless, 'such names […] will be sought, for what now is benevolence will in future become honour; and female tradition will not fail to hand down to posterity the formers and protectresses' of such a plan, which promises to 'exalt for ever the female annals of Great Britain.'[112] There is much to unpack here. First is the extent to which Burney clearly felt comfortable in her identity, one that carried enough moral weight to speak out in favour of a group which continued to sit uneasily despite royal support. Critical here is her conscious carving out of a female sphere of influence, a typically anti-revolutionary device Lisa Wood identified in the anti-Jacobin literature of the 1790s.[113] This also marked a development from her earlier thinking regarding female agency. In contrast to the scepticism of female solidarity in *Evelina,* or the failure of politeness in *Cecilia*, *Brief Reflections* suggests that economic agency among Christian women is in fact able to exert a profound effect on patriarchal influence. Lastly, she hopes that Christian women, the audience, can escape and judge identity without fear of violent disruption. In other words, concentrated economic power among women had the potential to create profound cultural change, indeed, to influence the history books.

Frances did not sacrifice her strong pro-Catholic voice. The relief of the clergy was not, in other words, her attempt to convert others to the Anglicanism she found so necessary to scrupulously perform elsewhere. Politeness, to follow on from *Cecilia*, was still acknowledged to be the expression of a protestant hegemony. Where *Brief Reflections* differs from *Cecilia,* then, is in its plain acknowledgement of the similarities between Anglicanism and Catholicism. Burney asks the reader 'to be brethren with the good, wheresoever they may arise', as 'the world, in all its varied stores of good, contains nothing that can vie with philanthropy.'[114] 'But while 'to the individual we talk of alms,' she argues that the 'we may be bolder, juster, firmer, and talk of duties' to the community. Burney then pointedly draws on this Christian community over any ecumenical differences, echoing Thrale's comparison to the Islamic east:

---

[111] Burney, *Brief Reflections,* 5.
[112] Burney, *Brief Reflections,* 6.
[113] Lisa Wood, *Modes of Discipline: Women's Conservatism, and the Novel After the French Revolution* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2003), 13.
[114] Burney, *Brief Reflections,* 13.

> Shall we see […] martyrs that remind us of other days – and let them perish? […] Anticipate the answer, anticipate the historians of times to come: will they not say, "These Holy men, who died for want of bread, were Priests of the Christian religion. They had committed no sin, they had offended against no law: they refused to take an oath which their consciences disapproved; their piety banished them from their country; and the land in which they sought refuge received, admired, relieved - neglected, forgot, and finally permitted them to starve![115]

Burney raises the spectre of intra-confessional violence which had been used to enforce Protestant hegemony, only to contrast this past with the present Jacobin threat. Protestant and Catholic violence may bubble to the surface – but it is nothing in comparison to the disaster in France. Here the perspective of the 'historian of times to come' is critical. Her argument is not just founded on the moral duty to help their Christian brothers but in comparing *ancien regime* France with *ancien regime* England. Both countries, after all, persecuted those who 'refused to take an oath which their consciences disapproved.' Catholics in France and Protestants in England are thus conflated, with confessional differences subordinate to the organisation of the state. Burney therefore explicitly rejects any argument that Catholicism necessarily leads to autocracy, an argument she had been hinting at for the past twenty years.

Meanwhile, the Burney family had grown closer to the sinews of empire. Frances' younger sister Charlotte's first marriage had been to Clement Francis in 1786. Dr Clement Francis accompanied Warren Hastings back to England, landing a week before his friend James Burney, and though he had resolved in India to marry the author of Evelina, he found a stronger rapport with Frances' sister Charlotte.[116] This points both to Burney's fame in colonial society, something which will become even more apparent in her husband's dealings with Napoleon. This renown did not however signify moral laxity, but instead prompted marriage offers. Charles' assent to the match, despite the age difference (Clement was some sixteen years older) and his profession, also provides a useful counter to Charles' attitude to Richard's supposed sin of marrying abroad. Whether this was due to a sense that conceiving and raising children abroad distanced them from Britishness, or because Richard had committed some other sin, is not apparent. Nevertheless, with Burney meeting Hastings at the

[115] Burney, *Brief Reflections*, 14 – 5.
[116] Harman, *Fanny Burney*, *188.*

house of her brother-in-law, the Burney family's colonial margins and thus the presence of the empire and its anxieties in their imaginations must be continually recalled. [117]

Yet while questions of loyalty and family identity continued to preoccupy Charles, his ability to bend his daughters to his will had weakened. Charlotte's links to India continued with her second marriage. This time, however, her father's attitude to her suitor had hardened.[118] Charles' physical health had never truly recovered from the exertion of 1792-3, from the departure of Susanna to Ireland in September 1796, or the death of his second wife which precipitated a long 'fit of gloom.'[119] As ever, work was to be the cure. Frances encouraged him firstly to work on his manuscript poems, and secondly to collaborate with Thomas Twining on a periodical.[120] *Astronomy, an Historical & Didactic Poem* did the trick, with Burney so engaged in reading out draft stanzas to anyone who'd listen, Herschel among them, that it was not until Lady Crewe finally caved and pointed out that everyone thought he was committing crimes against poetry that he finally gave up in 1807.[121] While the work-cure was successful however, it came at the expense of 'sympathy', with Charlotte:

> nervous enough of him to feel obliged to use Frances as her envoy to ask her father's consent to her second marriage – an embassy that had but indifferent success. Charlotte's choice was Ralph Broome, formerly a judge advocate in India, and an emphatic defender, through journalism, of Warren Hastings. Broome had brought back with him from India a natural daughter by an Indian woman of "High Rank" Charlotte agreed that the girl should live with them.[122]

Yet it was not the existence of Ralph's illegitimate child that vexed Charles, but rather Broome's politics. Charles feared Broome was little more than a 'Democrat if not Jacobin'.[123] This further complicates unproblematic ideas of racial infection as the source of Richard's ostracization. Nevertheless, Broome's politics 'in which [Frances wrote] he has no mercy for a dissentient opinion' were enough to damn their marriage to a worse fate than that of Frances and Alexandre: not only did Charles not attend the ceremony on 1st March 1787, but

[117] Harman, *Fanny Burney,* 215.
[118] Clement Francis had died in 1792, and it says much about her family's attitude towards her that Frances was being pushed to live as a companion to Charlotte and her three very young children. Harman, *Fanny Burney,* 251.
[119] Margaret Anne Doody, *Frances Burney,* 275.
[120] Roger Lonsdale, *Dr Charles Burney,* 383-4.
[121] Lonsdale, *Dr Charles Burney*, 403.
[122] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 276.
[123] Ibid.

'he punished Charlotte by not seeing her for some time afterwards.'[124] The Burney family's inextricability from contemporary political struggles, coming so soon after Frances' own extrication from her immured life at court and marriage to a constitutionalist Catholic French exile, therefore suggest not only that Charles considered the marriage of his daughters as a risk to his own British identity, but also that his autocratic hold over the family had begun to slip.

Even after her marriage however, Charles continued to co-opt Frances' writing. As the Burney family project grew ever more intertwined with empire,[125] Charles began to consider literary intervention against the Jacobin threat. '[B]y the end of January 1797' and still fixated on his astronomical poem, Mrs Crewe suggested that Frances and Charles, 'with the help of Windham and Canning edit a strictly anti-jacobinical and professedly monarchical' magazine, an idea which he declined only after Frances had refused to participate.[126] The desire to publish against the Jacobins, however, clearly did not disappear. Emphasising the reactionary nature of Charles' political views, Doody points to how '[h]is family suspected that he was the author of an article in the reactionary periodical *The Anti-Jacobin*, in December 1797.'[127] The content, a '(fictitious) letter' in which a daughter complains how the adoption of radical politics by her father disturbed their domestic felicity and her plans to marry a soldier, seems to contain 'Dr Burney with his political views reversed'.[128] Whether or not Charles was the author, it nevertheless demonstrates both the extent to which, as Doody suggests, 'Charles Burney could write in the persona of a daughter', but also of the nature and persistence of his political views and thus how his daughter's literary production was inextricable from his own. In the case of the periodical, however, this episode – a clear extension of the *Brief Reflections* pamphlet of 1793 - suggests the quasi-existence of a reactionary salon centred around the Burney family, and which again sought to use Frances' fame both as an author and wife of a French Roman Catholic as the political face of their campaign. Yet while Frances was happy to adopt the language of separate spheres in support

[124] Ibid.
[125] Such links were not confined to India. Molesworth Phillips, James Burney's close friend and shipmate, married Susan Burney in early January 1782. Fears of his fiery temper were abated by the promise of large estates in Ireland. These soon turned out to be much smaller than intimated, and Charles was forced to loan him £2,000 without hope of repayment, in the forlorn hope of extricating his daughter from a marriage which had turned violent.
See: Chisolm, *Fanny Burney*, 116, 137, 170; Doody, *Frances Burney*, 282;
[126] Lonsdale, *Dr Charles Burney*, 386
[127] Doody, *Frances Burney*, 276.
[128] Ibid.

of the émigré French clergy, and was no friend of the Jacobins, she was not prepared to take such a hard line in 1797. As Doody puts it, 'her political views were not the same as her fathers', to which we might add that she was no longer afraid of voicing her dissent.[129]

Meanwhile, Frances and Alexandre were desperately in need of money. Burney had begun one of the earliest versions of what was to become *Camilla* as early as 1792, with her father and the Lockes reading 'Betulia' in June 1793.[130] Yet as Chisholm points out, the realities of their situation soon interrupted their honeymoon.[131] D'Arblay had lost everything in the revolution, and the hope engendered by a Royalist uprising in Toulon in September of that year was quickly crushed.[132] Their income was already straightened. In addition to the pension from the queen, Frances technically had £20 per annum investment income from her second novel, but the failure of the only tragedy she staged during her lifetime followed by the birth of their son Alexander, made the work-in-progress the obvious choice. Catherine Gallagher and Janice Farrar Thaddeus, along with their contemporaries, point to the driving pecuniary necessity of the novel as both formative and corrosive.[133] This need for money, so the argument goes, implicitly impoverished *Camilla.* Emma Pink, however, disagrees. Not only does it neglect *Camilla's* production history, but 'invokes a dichotomy which opposes aesthetic and commercial concerns.' Instead, she argues that *Camilla* 'is evidence of Burney's growing confidence in and commitment to her writing life.'[134] As Epstein pointed out, Frances had always written both compulsorily and for financial reasons; as soon as her authorship of *Evelina* had been revealed, her father and Samuel Crisp came together to assume management for her financial benefit.[135] With Crisp dead and Frances newly confident in asserting her differences from her father, new possibilities emerged.

The model of publication via subscription for *Camilla* was, despite its suggestion by her father and brother, an opportunity to escape their control. From *Evelina* onwards, and thanks

[129] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 205.
[130] Ibid
[131] Chisholm, *Fanny Burney,* 173
[132] Ibid.
[133] Catherine Gallagher, *Nobody's Story: The Vanishing Acts of Women Writers in the Marketplace,* 1670 – 1820 (Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995), 253;
See also Thaddeus, *Frances Burney*, 115, who also emphasises Susanna's role in emphasising 'Print!' as a way to remove 'present difficulties.'
[134] Emma E. Pink, 'Frances Burney's *Camilla*: "To Print my Grand Work … by Subscription."' *Eighteenth-Century Studies,* Vol. 40, No. 1 (Fall, 2006), 51-68, 55-6.
[135] Epstein, *The Iron Pen,* 7, 24-5.

to her involvement in her father's publishing, Burney had understood the complexities of publication. Yet this did not mean that she was not subject to exploitation, both by publishers and family. As her own handwriting of *Evelina* would be recognised thanks to her status as her father's amenuensis, her brother Charles acted as intermediary with Thomas Lowndes. Yet it was Burney herself, Chisholm notes, who bargained via letter with the publisher, securing an increase in the sale of the copyright from 20 to 30 guineas.[136] For *Cecilia*, as a 'celebrated novelist' and paired with her father, Pink suggests she was in a much more favourable position. Yet while they choose Payne and Cadell because Burney's brother was married to Payne's daughter, Payne and Cadell promptly took advantage: while the deal was £200 for the first edition and £50 for the second, with the usual first edition print run comprising 500 sets, they instead 'printed a first edition of 2,000.'[137] Worse, although this first edition sold out in October, the publishers dragged their heels with the remaining £50 until December.[138] With *Camilla*, Burney's family refused to see her cheated once more. Hemlow suggests that her father, with James and Charles, 'formed a triumvirate insisting she bring the works out by subscriptions at a guinea and a half each.'[139] Key in Burney's acceptance, both Pink and Hemlow agree here, was the desire to provide an income for her son.[140] Publishing by subscription - while potentially humiliating - could also be extremely lucrative, and therefore provided the possibility of such an inheritance.[141] As Burney excitedly writes of the materiality of the paper that will make up her new work then, she articulates ever more strongly her confidence in the strength of her identity to withstand close association with the machinery of capital.[142]

---

[136] Chisholm, *Fanny Burney*, 42-43;
Still, this was a bargain. Harman estimates that, assuming Lowndes kept the price at the 9 shillings per set agreed for the first edition, he would have made £810. Harman, *Fanny Burney*, 147.
Also interesting is the assumption that Burney could not have written *Evelina* alone. Julie Parks points out that Lowndes 'guessed the novel had been written by Horace Walpole because he too had "published a book in this snug manner."' This of course implies that authorship was a communal endeavour, rooted to her family. Julie Park, "Pains and Pleasures of the Automaton: Frances Burney's Mechanics of Coming Out" *Eighteenth-Century Studies* Vol. 40, No. 1 (Fall, 2006), 23-49, 33.

[137] Pink, *Frances Burney's Camilla*, 54-5.
[138] Ibid.
[139] Hemlow, *Fanny Burney*, 250.
[140] Hemlow, *Fanny Burney*, 250; Pink, *Frances Burney's Camilla,* 57.
[141] Pink, *Frances Burney's Camilla,* 59; Thaddeus, *Frances Burney*, 130
[142] This was not without its wobbles, of course. Not only was she still uneasy about the cultural associations of such an endeavour, but the loans to Molesworth Phillips, combined with the Pitt's Stamp Act of 1795, made exclusively private printing impossible. Pink, *Frances…*, 57.

Publishing by subscription not only demonstrated Burney's fluency in the business of publishing, but also provided an opportunity to demonstrate social approbation for her marriage. First of all, however, she 'needed the good opinion of the royal family.'[143] Yet while Mrs Boscowan, Mrs Locke, and Mrs Crewe worked 'tirelessly', with the printing costs coming to almost twice Burney's pension, and subscribers only promising money, the whole process remained unnerving.[144] She need not have worried. In addition to selling the copyright to Payne and Caddell for £1000,[145] Burney's list of subscribers spanned over 1000 persons over 37 pages.[146] Arranged alphabetically, each letter is split into 'descending order of rank,' with her royal subscribers 'given pride of place' giving further cachet to those able to subscribe and see their social credit proved by inclusion alongside the nobility. It was for this reason that Burney unwillingly relegated 'the fifteen French subscribers, including two princes, a princess, and a duchess,' to the end of the list. [147] The cultural capital evinced by the list is, as Pink and Sabor argue, substantial: it spans from Warren Hastings, Edmund Burke, Joseph Banks' to 'Maria Edgeworth […], Elizabeth Montagu, Hannah More, and Horace Walpole.' In other words, from Whig to Tory and every position in between. Yet this does not just suggest an attempt to display the cultural capital of Burney's literary career. Rather, in the separate-but-equal status of the French subscribers in the list, the preface reveals itself as a politically theatrical document, one that finds its roots in the theatre of the self she identified so boldly in *Evelina*. Printing a novel by subscription, then, permitted Burney to invert that first encounter with performing womanhood on the public stage; Frances here selects her audience, and in so doing, reveals her pride and her confidence that her poly-centric, Catholic-tinged identity could thrive after the tumult of the French Revolution.

Burney's establishment credentials were particularly useful, as the publication of *Camilla* coincided with Mrs Meeke's first novels. Between 1795 and 1823, Meeke would write 26 novels, alongside translations and children's books. Not only were her relatives in London aware of her efforts, but as Simon Macdonald argues, Frances' brother Charles was

[143] Thaddeus, *Frances Burney,* 132.
[144] Ibid.
[145] Mediated by her brother Charles, who was instructed to handle potential publishers with 'promised Jewish callousness.' Edward A and Lillian D Bloom, 'Introduction' Frances Burney, *Camilla, or a Picture of Youth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009),ix – xxvi, vii.
[146] Ibid.
[147] Pink, *Frances Burney's Camilla,* 59.

favourably – and anonymously – reviewing her work in the *Monthly Review*.[148] This in itself was rare – although the Burney family had a long connection with the magazine, Charles Burney Jr rarely reviewed novels.[149] The degree to which the Burney family cohered around Frances' publications then must not be overshadowed by their enduring links to Mrs Meeke. Although this thesis lacks the space in which to compare Meeke's publications to Burney's, the spectre of her errant stepsister must have cast a long shadow over the latter half of Burney's literary work. Yet because Mrs Meeke distanced herself from the Burney family in a way that Frances had and could not after her authorship of *Evelina* had been uncovered, they were able to support both in different ways without poisoning the family's reputation.

Camilla's success can be read in the Queen's effusive reaction to *Camilla's* dedication. On the 26th February 1796, Mrs Schwellenberg wrote with new of 'her Majestys Commands to say she gives leave for you to Dedicate youre Books to her.'[150] *Camilla's* dedication was suitably brief, but gushing. Those who only know the Queen by rank may be surprised that mere scenes of 'common life' may be brought to her attention by the mere 'inhabitant of a retired cottage', but Burney matches the Queen's gracious permission by the 'recollections' of her time spent in service.[151] As such, she permits herself 'the inference I seem here to leave open of annexing undue importance to a production of apparently so light a kind […] should I dare seek such patronage?'[152] In contrast to *Evelina's* dedication to her father, here Burney identifies herself as a member of the Queen's coterie. In contrast to the male world of patronage of her first novel in which blood and ink intermingle, here she looks back to overlook the suffering of her time at court in order to ally herself with a different yet no less legitimate feminine tradition. No longer vying for space among male intellectual inheritances, she can 'seek such patronage' because she and the Queen can share 'recollections'. In this sense then, and perhaps paradoxically considering her miserable experience under the Queen, Burney acknowledges the possibility not just of female intellectual prowess, but of the Protestant communities in which the novel germinated.

[148] Simon Macdonald, 'Identifying Mrs Meeke: Another Burney Family Novelist' *The Review of English Studies*, 64 (2013), 367 – 385, 375.
[149] Roger Lonsdale suggests that Charles Burney père had used three articles in *The Monthly Review* via William Bewley to destroy the prospects of his rival John Hawkin's *History of Music*. Lonsdale, 209.
[150] FBA to CB, 4 March 1796 A.L (Berg) Quoted in Hemlow, *Fanny Burney*, 251. Idiosyncratic spelling Mrs Schwellenberg's own.
[151] 'To the Queen' in Frances Burney, *Camilla* (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 3-4, 3.
[152] Ibid.

While the thought of a French Catholic on Hanoverian ground remains unsettling, . This was reinforced by her presentation of the work to the Queen, though 'M. d'Arblay who carried ten presentation volumes of *Camilla*, [at first] ventured only as far as the iron palings.'[153]

> When we came to the Iron Rails, poor Miss Planta, in much fidget, begged to take the books from M. d'Arblay, terrified, I imagine, lest *French feet* contaminate the gravel within. […] The Queen was in her Dressing Room, and with only the Princess Elizabeth. Her reception was the most gracious imaginable – yet, when she saw my emotion in thus meeting her again, she was herself by no means quite unmoved, - I presented my little, though not *small* offering, upon one knee, placing them, as she directed, upon a table by her side, and expressing, as well as I could, my devoted gratitude for her invariable goodness to me.[154]

Invited back the next day, with a promise that she would meet the other princesses, she instead sees that 'the King entered the apartment! – and entered it to receive my own little offering!'[155] As before, the King is curious about the intricacies of literary production, asking her 'who corrected my proofs.'[156] While she claimed she did so herself, her answer ignores her husband's role as amenuensis and editor. The fear that her work would be seen as Catholic endured. Despite these fears however, the couple were both invited to dine the following evening, an invitation to which she 'could scarce believe my Ears – my Senses!' and had to 'make certain whether or not Monsieur was really invited to The Queen's Lodge.'[157] Burney's comment about 'french feet contaminat[ing] the gravel within' only to then be welcomed 'to The Queen's lodge' point as much to the unsettled British soil without as the encroachment of male feet on the convent ground. With Alexandre's welcome however, Burney can briefly relax; the court is still strong enough to weather the memory of the French Catholic threat, strong enough indeed to welcome its ghosts.

Camilla begins with an explicit struggle with disrupted history and inheritance. At first, Sir Hugh alighted on Indiana as his heir. His obvious affection for her to the detriment of Camilla 'was soon pointed out by the servants.' Yet:

> In less than a month after the residence of Camilla at Cleves, Sir Hugh took the resolution of making her his heiress. Even Mr Tyrold, notwithstanding his fondness

[153] Hemlow, *Fanny Burney*, 252.
[154] Frances Burney d'Arblay, Journal letter to Dr Charles Burney, (Windsoriana, Part 1 and 2) July 10th 1796, in Peter Sabor, ed, *JL*, 378 – 382, 379-80.
[155] Ibid, 380
[156] Ibid, 381
[157] Windsoriana, 382.

> for Camilla, remonstrated against a partiality so injurious to his nephew and niece, as well as to the rest of his family. And Mrs Tyrold, though her secret heart subscribed, without wonder, to a predilection in favour of Camilla, was maternally disturbed for her other children, and felt her justice sensibly shocked.[158]

Like Burney's previous work, *Camilla* is obsessed with the question of how to morally assert inheritance and legitimacy where no patrilineal line exists. The spectre of an absent heir haunts both families. Even before the sickness which disrupts the inheritance again, the Tyrolds are well aware both of the contingency of Sir Hugh's choice and the sense that with the absence of a first-born son any other choice is fragile. This is further evidence, of course, of Miranda Burgess' argument that romances were spaces in which the new national emotional economy of post-Stuart monarchy and society were worked out.[159] But it is also a deeper meditation on history and social order. As the narrator argues in the first words of the novel, attempting to capture 'the human heart [and] her most rapid vicissitudes, her most unassimilating eccentricities' is almost impossible 'in one grand and general view.'[160] Yet this – Hume, Smith, and Burgess would suggest - is what the author/historian is left with after 1688. *Camilla* therefore begins with both an assertion of the difficulty not just of writing history in a society after the great chain of being, but with a wider scepticism of the possibility of any social order or hierarchy, since 'in our neighbours we cannot judge [and] in ourselves we dare not trust it.'

Nevertheless, Eugenia's experience at the fair reflects a visibly contested British landscape. Camilla was soon 'informed of the riches she was destined to inherit.'[161] Before long, she mediates the servant's petitions, and promises to act as her family's benefactress. On a visit to Camilla, however, Lavinia's promise to their mother not to let the unvaccinated Eugenia go to a local fair is broken when their brother Lionel breaks rank and gallops towards it. Sir Hugh sent his footman on ahead to 'keep a sharp look out that nobody has the small pox.'[162] Worse unable to refuse his nieces, he then allows them out of his carriage to buy gifts, and:

> was selecting presents for them all, when the little group, ignorant whom they should encounter, advanced towards the same booth: but he had hardly time to exclaim, 'Oho! have you caught us?' when the innocent voice of Eugenia, calling out, 'Little

[158] Burney, *Camilla*, 15.
[159] See Chapter 2; Miranda J Burgess, *British Fiction and the Production of Social Order, 1740 – 1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 18.
[160] Burney, *Camilla*, 7.
[161] Burney, *Camilla*, 16.
[162] Ibid.

> boy; what's the matter with your face, little boy?' drew his attention another way, and he perceived a child apparently just recovering from the small pox.
> Edgar, who at the same instant saw the same dreaded sight, darted forward, seized Eugenia in his arms, and, in defiance of her playthings and her struggles, carried her back to the coach; while Lavinia, in an agony of terror, ran up to the little boy, and, crying out, 'O go away! go away!' dragged him out of the booth, and, perfectly unconscious what she did, covered his head with her frock, and held him fast with both her hands.[163]

If *Evelina* and *Cecilia* began with heroines learning how to navigate the ordered streets of London, building up their fluency in the bodily language of politeness, then this scene shows Burney introducing a young woman unvaccinated by politeness to the messy realities hiding beneath the veneer of Hanoverian sociability. Anne Wohlcke describes these fairs as 'opportunities to contest dominant understandings of the orderly nation,' as the crowd and state struggled for control of urban space.[164] This only intensified as 'new housing arrangements, patterns of consumption, traffic, and pollution shaped urban experience at all levels.'[165] In this context, fairs 'existed between two worlds,' 'with medieval and religious origins' which had nevertheless 'transformed to largely secular events' with 'commercial entertainment' by the eighteenth century.[166] Unsurprisingly, eighteenth-century commentators were terrified by these mixed social spaces, 'unstable events' full of drinking and immorality, which could not be 'captured in maps and street directories.'[167] Social order and family order break down, Eugenia is infected, and Camilla disinherited by an anarchic space that is anything but polite. If the polite spaces of *Evelina* and *Cecilia* were predicated on a fashionable consumption, cut adrift from an awkward and bloody history, where subjects could mix on the pretence of equality, then the ludic space of the fair threatened to expose the fragility of the Hanoverian regime. There is no Madame Duval or Mrs Delvile ready to take charge. Just as the incursion of creditors, the unpaid artisans, and disfigured builders drove Mr Harrel to suicide, so too does exposure to an impolite space bring Eugenia close to death.

The unsettled landscape at the heart of *Camilla* therefore reflects both the spectre of the French Revolution, and the presence of the émigré Catholic clergy on the London streets. David Lemmings cites Shoemaker's assertion that 'suffused throughout the actions of

[163] Burney, *Camilla*, 23-4.
[164] Anne Wohlcke, *The 'Perpetual Fair': Gender, Disorder, and Urban Amusement in Eighteenth-Century London* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2014), 197.
[165] Wohlcke, *The Perpetual Fair*, 3.
[166] Ibid.
[167] Ibid.

eighteenth-century crowds was a sense of legitimacy', one rooted in 'traditional crowd gathering techniques such as bonfires, illuminations, and processions,' as well as 'events on holidays and official anniversaries.'[168] As the eighteenth century drew on, these 'customary rights and customs of government associated with common law proceedings' were in turn challenged by an expanding, centralised legal state that sought to impose order and conformity.[169] Inoculation here stands as a metaphor for learning politeness. That is, not just competing Catholic history and Stuart claims, but raucous popular identities and sovereignties which could disrupt the totalising claims of Hanover to their subjects' thoughts and bodies. In contrast to the benign identities of Mrs Delvile, or the ridiculous assertions of Madame Duval however, popular sovereignty in the wake of the French Revolution holds a new terror. To step back a little, exposure to the crowd destabilises an already fragile system of inheritance and family continuity. Just as the right sort of crowd – in other words, proto-bourgeois, gentry, white Anglican - ensures a woman's place within the social order, the spectre of the mob and its appeal to popular legitimacy not only leaves Eugenia broken in body, but in displacing her sister disrupts a constitutional order founded on emotive links. While *Camilla* begins with a statement of the impossibility of a stable Hanoverian social order, it then goes on to react with horror to the alternative over the channel.

It is important, then, to note Frances' experience of the failures of immunisation in the Royal Family. In the immediate years preceding Frances Burney's entrance at court, the family suffered the deaths of two of their sons. Although Prince Alfred (22nd September 1780 – 20th August 1782) had always been sickly, his inoculation by the Hawkins Brothers precipitated 'prolonged bouts of fever' which ended only with his death.[170] Octavius (23rd February 1779 – 3 May 1783), was their eighth son and particularly adored by his father, who always sought 'ways to involve him in more grown-up pleasures.'[171] In April 1783, eight months after the death of his brother, Octavius too was inoculated. Within a few days however, it was clear something was wrong. One week later, he was dead. The degree to which the deaths of the princes went on to poison the happiness of the Royal couple cannot be underestimated.[172] With excess grief seen to be a sign of wavering faith, denial of their anguish over the deaths

[168] David Lemmings, *Law and Government in England During the Long 18th Century: From Consent to Command* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 6.
[169] Lemmings, *Law and Government,* 1- 2.
[170] Flora Fraser, *Princesses: The Six Daughters of George III* (London: John Murray, 2005), 71-2.
[171] Janice Hadlow, *The Strangest Family: The Private Lives of George III, Queen Charlotte, and the Hanoverians* (London: William Collins, 2014), 293.
[172] Hadlow, *The Strangest Family,* 295.

of their son was inextricably bound up with the performance and maintenance of their royal authority. Charles himself had once had to remind Frances of the proper limits of grief.[173] As Frances could well attest, the spectres of the children continued to haunt both the court and the King's mind. On February 2nd 1787, she received a gift from none other than Sir Robert Strange, who presented her with 'a proof plate of his Print of the Apotheosis of the two little Princes, Octavius & Alfred.'[174] Then, as the King slipped into logorrhoeic psychosis, a fixation on the recently lost American colonies raged while he cradled a pillow he believed to be Octavius.[175] Even without considering either the emotional attachment to their sons and the tensions of emotional restriction intrinsic to the performance of Royal identity, Burney's time at court clearly coincided with the identification of smallpox with a dangerous unravelling of the body politic. Infection, then, was not a purely medical event, [176] but as Sir Hugh's disrupted sight suggests, a constant and troublingly egalitarian presence that threatened social hierarchy.

This influence of the King's illness is particularly apparent in Sir Hugh's reaction to his niece's sickness. While Eugenia lays feverish with smallpox, Sir Hugh:

---

[173] Elizabeth Rowe's 1729 book on popular piety *Friendship in Death: Twenty Lessons from the Dead to the Living* was a bestseller throughout the eighteenth century. It explicitly forbade excessive mourning as a sign of impiety. Harman points to its reference in *Camilla* as a sign that Burney had probably read it during the death of her own mother in 1762. Claire Harman, *Fanny Burney: A Biography*, (London: Flamingo, 2001), 28.
The influence of Rowe on Charles' thinking is also apparent in his advice to Frances after the death of her second 'Daddy' Charles Crisp. Writing to his daughter, he warned her to limit her grief and instead to perform her role well:

> I am much more afflicted than surprised at the violence and duration of your sorrow for the terrible scenes and events at Chesington, and not only pity you, but participate in all your feelings. Not an hour in the day has passed, as you will some time or other find, since the fatal catastrophe, in which I have not felt a pang for the irreparable loss I have sustained However, as something is due to the living, there is, perhaps, a boundary at which it is right to endeavour to stop in lamenting the dead. It is very hard, as I have found it all my life, to exceed these bounds in our duty or attention, without its being at the expense of others. i have lost in my time persons to dear to me, as to throw me into the utmost affliction and despondency which can be suffered without insanity; but I had claims on my life, my reason, and activity, which drew me from the pit of despair, and forced me, though with great difficulty, to rouse and exert every nerve and faculty in answering them. It has been very well said of mental wounds, that they must digest, like those of the body, before they can be healed.

Charles Burney to Frances Burney, April-June 1783, Charlotte Barrett, ed, *The Diary and Letters of Madame d'Arblay, Author of Evelina, Cecilia, &c, Edited by Her Niece*, Vol. II, 1781 – 1786, (London: Henry Colburn, 1842), 268 – 9, 268.
[174] Strange's 1786 Print was after the painting by Benjamin West. Frances Burney to Susanna Burney Phillips, Journal letter, 2nd February 1787, Stewart Cooke, ed., *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney: Volume II*, (Oxford: Clarendom, 2011), 61-4, 61.
[175] Kate Chisholm, *Fanny Burney: Her Life* (London: Vintage, 1998), 148.
[176] Although Julia Epstein notes that Burney conducted extensive research to ensure her representation of inoculation and infection was accurate. Julia Epstein, *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 63.

> gave himself up wholly to despair: he darkened his room, refused all food but bread and water, permitted no one to approach him, and reviled himself invariably with the contrition of a wilful murderer. In this state he remained, until the distemper unexpectedly took a sudden and happy turn, and the surgeon made known, that his patient might possibly recover. The joy of Sir Hugh was now as frantic as his grief had been the moment before: he hastened to the drawing-room, commanded that the whole house should be illuminated; promised a year's wages to all his servants; bid his house-keeper distribute beef and broth throughout the village; and sent directions that the bells of the village should be rung for a day and a night.[177]

Sir Hugh's voluntary seclusion reflects the King's confinement, and the wider rejoicing over the King's first recovery with the Eugenia's recovery. Yet just like the celebrations of the King's recovery, Sir Hugh's joy is soon be proved premature. The picture here is once more one of an order interrupted. While Julie Parks argues that the preponderance of automata throughout the novel points to how Camilla is forever 'suspended in the act of becoming' a woman, so too is family unit suspended from its foundational aspect of social control.[178] Burney here shows what was supposed to happen, full in the knowledge that with the King it was only to presage further decline. The mob destabilises the authority of the father-as-king. When the threat is seen to pass, the social aspect of the illness is affirmed by the effusive bounty promised. Yet by reducing sovereignty already weakened by displacement from father to uncle to a nakedly contractual obligation that can be broken by misjudgement and then 'righted' by the prospect of a glut, which in turn can only darkly mirror the early modern rituals of glut and famine itself associated with the fair that destabilised the arrangement, the wider picture remains bleak as Burney depicts a newly visible social contract.

Eugenia's recovery therefore remains stilted. Eugenia's father interrupts Sir Hugh's rejoicing to 'represen[t] the still precarious state' of his daughter and the dangers she yet faces.[179] Sir Hugh 'desperately reversed all his orders, returned sadly to his dark room, and protested he would never more rejoice' until Eugenia's mother brought good news.[180] '[A]t length,' good

[177] Burney, *Camilla*, 28-9.
[178] Julie Parks, 'Pains and Pleasures of the Automaton: Frances Burney's Mechanics of Coming Out' *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Fall 2006), 23-49, 40
[179] Burney, *Camilla*, 29.
[180] Ibid.

news of a sort arrived, Eugenia, although 'seamed and even scarred by the horrible disorder was declared out of danger' and 'would soon be well.'[181] Sir Hugh, however, seems to hear only good news until he reaches Eugenia's sickbed, where in an echo of Mr Delville's encounter with the moribund Cecilia, he is faced only with his own sin:

> Sir Hugh, in an ecstasy which no power could check, forgot every pain and infirmity to hurry up to the apartment of the little girl, that he might kneel, he said, at her feet, and there give thanks for her recovery: but the moment he entered the room, and saw the dreadful havoc grim disease had made on her face; not a trace of her beauty left, no resemblance by which he could have known her; he shrunk back, wrung his hands, called himself the most sinful of all created beings, and in the deepest despondence, sunk into a chair and wept aloud.[182]

He immediately rises, and pledges to disinherit Camilla to compensate Eugenia for her loss. It is no wonder then that many critics view the rest of the novel as an interrogation of moral vs physical beauty. Felicity Nussbaum typifies this, arguing Eugenia becomes a 'symbol of a moral credit that is perversely invested in ugliness,' where 'infectious disease […] both mars a woman and makes her valuable.'[183] This reading can be fleshed out both by the link between the family and state already established by Burgess' reading of post-1688 romance plots, and Burney's understanding of the corporeality of nationalist identity. If we remember that Camilla was chosen because she was considered the most moderate, and that Sir Hugh's decision to disinherit her was both made and regretted in haste, then the political subtext becomes clearer. In other words, Eugenia's disfigurement and Sir Hugh's attempt to rectify it with financial means represent and repeat the Britain's attempt to assert legitimacy after the Protestant settlement.

This is a radical political reading. But it is one which is supported by the religious and legal oath Sir Hugh swears before he can change his mind, and to which he feels himself bound despite deep guilt for Camilla's situation. At the sight of Eugenia's facial scarring, he asks himself 'what amends, except a poor little trifle of money?—And as to that, she shall have it, God knows, every penny I am worth, the moment I am gone[.]'[184] Swearing again that 'a

[181] Ibid.
[182] Ibid.
[183] Felicity Nussbaum, *The Limits of the Human: Fictions of Anomaly Race, and Gender in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 124
[184] Ibid.

guinea for every pit in that poor face will I settle on her out of hand', but while 'Mrs Tyrold scare noticed this declaration,' Mr Tyrold:[185]

> endeavoured to dissuade him from so sudden and partial a measure: he would not, however, listen; he made what speed he could down stairs, called hastily for his hat and stick, commanded all his servants to attend him, and muttering frequent ejaculations to himself, that he would not trust to changing his mind, he proceeded to the family chapel, and approaching with eager steps to the altar, knelt down, and bidding every one hear and witness what he said, made a solemn vow, 'That if he might be cleared of the crime of murder, by the recovery of Eugenia, he would atone what he could for the ill he had done her, by bequeathing to her every thing he possessed in the world, in estate, cash, and property, without the deduction of a sixpence.'
> He told all present to remember and witness this, in case of an apoplexy before his new will could be written down.[186]

His conscience 'lightened', he returned to Eugenia's bedside to wait the arrival of 'the attorney of a neighbouring town.' Sir Hugh already doubts his own conviction to make penance. He foresaw, indeed, that the moment he sees the 'long-banished' Camilla en-route to the sick bed 'his heart smote him in her favour; his eyes filled with tears; he was unable to go on,' considering her as he did 'as an innocent creature whom he was preparing to injure.' Again seclusion, hiding from each other's sight, is the only possible answer. Sir Hugh, then, knows what he has done is to injure an 'innocent creature', but as he has already sworn before god his hands were tied; so, too, are the legal arrangements. Sir Hugh then articulates Burney's Humean paradox; the Protestant Settlement may have been an unjust disruption of royal power, but it was one that has been infiltrated into Anglican piety, inscribed into law, and sworn in front of the assembled nation. *Camilla* is as Parks argued a novel where adolescence is forever 'suspended', but it is also where such suspension is rooted in the historical disruption of the political order. Yet where Hume saw Hanoverian legitimacy accumulating with every year, Burney not only understood the anxiety this brought, but understood that the French Revolution posed a novel, severe threat.

Eugenia's subsequent classical education thus becomes a struggle to assert a new continuity. At first, it is Sir Hugh who attempts to remedy his own youthful ignorance by applying himself to Latin and Greek. Only when he has found it impossible does he suggest Dr Orkbourne teach the immobile Eugenia instead. She is found to be a natural student. But her

[185] Nussbaum points to the racial discourse at play here, (Nussbaum, *The Limits…,* 124-125*)*
[186] Burney, *Camilla,* 30.

newfound love of classical literature problematises her interactions on the marriage market. Part of the problem is that, as Doody argues:

> Eugenia has read little modern literature and no novels. A female Quixote bred on epics, she judges everything in epic terms, expecting nobility and absolute honour of herself and everyone else. She sticks to the Gretna Green marriage to which she could abducted by "Alphonso Bellamy"; she could legally get out of it, but she considers a *vow* as sacred – a view caught from her reading, an heroic view, but perhaps the wrong one. Eugenia is not an epic character, but a character who reads epics.[187]

Eugenia is thus doubly handicapped. Disability interrupts the visual discourse of Anglican Womanhood. But she also misunderstands how classical literature functioned in contemporary society. Yet as Doody identifies and Jerzy Lukowski articulates, classical learning in the eighteenth century created continuity with the classical past only through gendered performance. Lukowski argues that Greece and Rome not only 'furnished the paradigms of political, social, and intellectual success', but close study of 'language, laws and literature' both permitted the ruling class to compare itself to, and thereby place itself as descendants from, a classical tradition, while also promising readers that emulating the noble men of the past might permit a quasi-immortality.[188] Yet as Dr Orkborne, whose 'life had been spent in any study rather than that of human nature' demonstrates in a theme that recurs throughout the book in many characters, too close a study reveals only a paralysing discontinuity.[189] Orkborne, for example, is so distracted by thoughts of his 'long, critical, and difficult work in philology' that he does not even notice an angry bull threatening his young female charges.[190] Mere intellectual study cannot replace a lack of participation in the contemporary theatre of identity, nor can it make up for a disruption in the natural order.

Indeed, such a disruption entailed stricter adherence to gendered norms. The prospect of a classical education for a young woman was considered to be profoundly subversive: 'In the eyes of many around her, Eugenia has a double deformity – her inferior body and her superior education.'[191] The 'learned ladies' of Southampton make exactly this connection:

---

[187] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 243.
[188] Jerzy Lukowski, *The European Nobility in the Eighteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 58-9.
[189] Burney, *Camilla,* 38.
[190] Burney, *Camilla,* 38,139.
[191] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 243.

> This, shortly, made Eugenia stared at still more than her peculiar appearance. The misses, in tittering, ran away from the learned lady; the beaux contemptuously sneering, rejoiced she was too ugly to take in any poor fellow to marry her. Some imagined her studies had stinted her growth; and all were convinced her education had made her such a fright.'[192]

Yet as Doody goes on to argue, while Burney ensures the 'sympathetic reader is never in danger of reading her learning merely as a deformity', it 'does have its particular drawbacks.'[193] Burney and her family were particularly aware of this. When Dr Johnson offered to teach her Latin as he had done to Mrs Thrale, her father forbade it after several lessons for fear it would make her masculine.[194] Then, while at court, and despite the royal princesses being given extensive Latin instruction after Mme de Beaumont's instruction, Frances falsely claimed she knew no Latin whatsoever, despite Mr Digby and Miss Planta's suspicions to the contrary.[195] What this suggests, then, is not just the obvious point that classical education was gendered. But rather that the Burney understood that Classical masculine qualities, upon which Anglican England claimed descent from antiquity to rival that of royal primogeniture, were intrinsically bound up with a binary understanding of sex and gender. Classically educated men, in other words, required meek and virtuous un-educated women in order to prove and sustain their own manly roman virtue. It is therefore pointless to attempt to use classical learning in order to smooth over disruptions in body and lineage, because no such unproblematic descent exists. There is only the performance, and Eugenia's bookishness, like Dr Orkborne's, only inexorably points to their distance from the contemporary ideal.

Yet if Eugenia is forever excluded from these communal discourses of vision and identity, then Camilla is placed under extreme personal scrutiny. Although Camilla is disinherited, the Tyrolds still hope Camilla might marry Edgar Mandlebert. Mandlebert has been a ward of Camilla's father 'almost since infancy [and] was heir to one of the finest estates in the county.'[196] To her family's delight, the two quickly fall in love. Yet when Edgar tells his tutor Dr Marchmont, himself appointed by Camilla's father, that he wishes to marry her, Marchmont urges caution. Edgar may 'have known her from her childhood' and already

[192] Burney, *Camilla*, 749.
[193] Doody, *Frances Burney*, 243
[194] Doody, *Frances Burney*, 241.
[195] Frances Burney to Charles Burney, Monday 14th Jan 1788, Lorna J. Clark, ed. *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, Vol. 3: 1788, (Oxford: Clarendon, 2014), 61-9, 62-3.
[196] Burney, *Camilla*, 17.

loves ‘her fair, open, artless, and disinterested character’ but Mandelbert counsels that he must not ‘mistake promise for performance’ and instead ‘study her […] with new eyes, new ears, and new thoughts,’ as her status as a potential fiancée necessitates a complete ontological shift:

> Nothing must escape you; you must view as if you had never seen her before; the interrogatory, *Were she mine?* must be present at every look, every word, every motion; you must forget her wholly as Camilla Tyrold, you must think of her only as Camilla Mandlebert; even justice is insufficient during this period of probation, and instead of inquiring, "Is this right in her?" you must simply ask, "Would it be pleasing to me?'"[197]

Edgar is sceptical. But even though he acknowledges that Marchmont is a misogynist ‘I know you think ill of women’, he bows both to his tutor’s authority and his own scepticism ‘distrust of himself and of his powers.’[198] Mandelbert is thus prompted to an invasive surveillance and radical doubt of his own powers of perception by his tutor. Yet if Camilla is subject to an impossible level of scrutiny in the hope she her credit will be validated, then Eugenia’s capital pointedly relies on her being kept away from the public gaze. As Jason Farr points out, ‘one major obstacle to her maturation consists of learning how to navigate public spaces while her disfigurements are so visible to the spectating other.’[199] They are, indeed, so visible that as Nussbaum suggests she becomes a visible symbol of diseased credit.[200] Eugenia, then, becomes over-invested with capital, a figure divided by the need to be seen and to remain hidden from communal view lest the capital upon which she is founded becomes too visible and disturbs the natural performance of Anglican womanhood.[201] Yet that very visibility is a requirement for learning to become a woman, and its lack threatens to unpick the naturalised ideals of race, gender, and nation.

Edgar’s constant surveillance also works to unpick Camilla’s womanhood. Kristina Straub has written persuasively about the critical nature of dress and consumption to the ‘social duties of women […] in public life.’[202] Particularly important here are the economic anxieties

[197] Burney, *Camilla,* 159.
[198] Burney, *Camilla,* 161.
[199] Jason S. Farr, ‘Sharp Minds / Twisted Bodies: Intellect, Disability, and Female Education in Frances Burney’s “*Camilla*”’, *The Eighteenth Century,* Vol. 55, No. 1 (Spring 2014), 1 – 17, 3.
[200] Nussbaum, *The Limits…,* 124.
[201] Timothy J. LeCain, *The Matter of History: How Things Create the Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 192.
[202] Kristina Straub, *Divided Fictions: Fanny Burney and Feminine Strategy* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1987), 190.

of maintaining that identity. Like Frances in her youth, Camilla barely has the funds required to sustain the materiality of a 'public social life,' and though brief experiences teaches her 'she would be economically safer and wiser to stay within the family circle' Edgar and other pressures compel her into polite spheres.[203] This leads her into an impossible cycle of debt, eventually borrowing money for a ball gown in the mere hope that she will be seen by Edgar and she will be able to win him back. Yet while first seeing the debt-laden dress laid out on her bed, she comes to despair only when she sees herself in the mirror, where 'a more minute examination of her attire was not calculated to improve her serenity.'[204] Straub suggests that the 'material evidence of female economic disaster' […] strips feminine sartorial splendour of its hopeful significance in the courtship game.'[205] In other words, the dress no longer becomes a signifier of future economic and romantic security as Edgar's wife, but instead signifies only her ruin. This is correct. As LeCain points out, sensory and material experience is inextricable from social distinction. But crucially, sparked by her viewing herself in the mirror, this realisation of her own dissolution comes about in a similar fashion to the all-empowering scrutiny of Edgar's surveillance. Having examined herself too closely, and in what can only reflect Burney's own traumatic experiences at court, the illusion no longer holds, and she is reduced to the sum of her material parts.

Eugenia, too, is almost driven mad by seeing herself from other's perspectives. Elizabeth Rose Grunner points to the 'bizarre and discomfiting episode' where Lionel 'imprisons his sisters in Dubster's summer house, thereby exposing them 'to the comments of vulgar passers-by and misconstruction by Edgar.'[206] They might have been released earlier, but Mr. Dubster refuses to pay anyone to aid their escape, or even allow them to be paid. Money may combat 'imprisonment', but it is always inextricable from male authority. Critical too is that this marks the first time that Eugenia is aware that her broken leg and smallpox scars constitute disfigurement. Her first shock is when a boy asks whether she was put up there 'to frighten the crows':

> Eugenia, not understanding him, was once more re-commencing; but the first woman said—'I suppose you think we'll sarve you for looking at?—no need to be paid?' 'Yes, yes,' cried the second, 'Miss may go to market with her beauty; she'll not want for nothing if she'll shew her pretty face!'

[203] Straub, *Divided Fictions,* 191.
[204] Burney, *Camilla,* 721.
[205] Straub, *Divided Fictions,* 194.
[206] Grunner, *The Bullfinch and the Brother,* 31-2.

> 'She need not be afeard of it, however,' said the third, 'for 'twill never be no worse. Only take care, Miss, you don't catch the small pox!'
> 'O fegs, that would be pity!' cried the boy, 'for fear Miss should be marked.'
> […]
> Eugenia, to whom such language was utterly new, was now in such visible consternation, that Camilla, affrighted, earnestly charged Mr. Dubster to find any means, either of menace or of reward, to make them depart.
> 'Lauk, don't mind them, ma'am,' cried he, following Eugenia, 'they can't do you no hurt; though they are rather rude, I must needs confess the truth, to say such things to your face. But one must not expect people to be over polite, so far from London.[207]

This best encapsulates Burney's theory of visual identity. Although she is on a stage, a vantage point from which the others can look down with relative ease, she is pointedly not encountering the theatrical crowd which constructs and keeps watch over Anglican womanhood. Instead, as Mr Dubster points out, she is confronted with a mob that speaks a completely new language, and who are, 'rather rude […] to say such things to your face,' though one cannot expect politeness 'so far from London'. Eugenia remains unconsoled by the knowledge that politeness really does maintain a status quo at the expense of revealing her true difference. Indeed, several pages later she informs Camilla that 'I am no longer to be deceived or trifled with. I will no more expose to the light a form and face so hideous.'[208] Eugenia has been displayed on the stage, but the audience is uncomfortably monodirectional. Lacking politeness, they describe the world as it is, revealing Eugenia's intellectual capital as that of economic capital, which is then monstrously associated back with her deformity. Like Camilla's vision of herself through the penetrating subjectivity of Edgar, Eugenia's anagnorisis comes through seeing herself in the eyes of others. Once the social vision of identity constructed by her family has been broken, there is no return.

Seeing her slump into melancholy, Eugenia's father decides to raise her spirits by a family visit to see a beautiful but intellectually disabled woman. Camilla is 'astonished that her kind father should call their attention to beauty, at so sore and critical a junction.'[209] But their father asks them to meditate on the perseverance of a beautiful picture compared to the 'pain' and 'fragility' of seeing beauty, and 'how quickly its brilliancy of bloom will be blown.'[210] As they approach the house, the woman first demands a shilling, and then affirms she lives at

[207] Burney, *Camilla*, 286.
[208] Burney, *Camilla*, 294
[209] Burney, *Camilla*, 307.
[210] Ibid.

the house ‘almost black in the face before she would allow herself to take another breath.’[211] Next, the woman attempts to wring the neck of a cat, to whose screams she seems oblivious. The experience is deeply shocking. Heading back to the carriage, she demands: ‘Did you know this unhappy beauty was at that house? Did you lead me thither purposely to display to me her shocking imbecility?' He admits he did, in an explanation ripe with the visual discourse of enlightenment objectivity, which the Delviles had done so much to resist. He explains that he had ‘rel[ied] upon the excellence of your understanding’ to ‘ventur[e] upon an experiment more powerful […] than all reason could urge.’ This would ‘pla[y] upon the imagination,’ to ‘convinc[e] the judgement,’ and ‘make an impression that can never be effaced.’

> 'A sight,' cried Eugenia, 'to come home to me with shame!—O, my dear Father! your prescription strikes to the root of my disease!—shall I ever again dare murmur!—will any egotism ever again make me believe no lot so hapless as my own! I will think of her when I am discontented; I will call to my mind this spectacle of human degradation—and submit, at least with calmness, to my lighter evils and milder fate.'[212]

Eugenia has been inducted into a new community, one not quite a mirror image of wider polite society as seen by Evelina and Cecilia, but one where she is trained to redirect her gaze away from herself. The woman she witnesses is part of her own social class ‘her friends are opulent, and a woman is paid, to keep her in existence and in obscurity.’ Yet while re-integrating her into contemporary discourses of identity, this scene nevertheless points to the fundamental sublimation of the self and one’s own subjectivity ‘having never known brighter days, she is insensible to her terrible state’ that must be repressed in order to function. It is this annihilation, then, which she self-wills, and which is revealed to be at the core of successful Anglican Womanhood. The question then becomes whether a body in which both capital and deformity are so obvious to the observer can be successfully integrated into wider society of observers.

The negative answer comes in the failure of her classical education to equip her for the challenges of the marriage market. As her own mother points out shortly after Bellamy writes out of the blue to propose marriage, Eugenia must always be set apart from her family as

[211] Burney, *Camilla*, 309.
[212] Burney, *Camilla*, 310 -1.

'Our two eldest girls are but slightly provided for; and Eugenia is far more dangerously circumstanced, in standing so conspicuously apart, as a prize to some adventurer.'[213] Mr Tyrold however, is calmed by Eugenia's careful response to Bellamy's letter, in which she urges him to 'Dwell not, sir, upon this disappointment, but receive my best wishes for your restored happiness; for never can I forget a distinction to which I have so little claim.' Her mother, on the other hand, argues 'a mere fortune hunter' would take such a gentle dismissal as encouragement. The argument seems to be settled by the arrival of her tutor, who 'believe[s] it will do very sufficiently,' though he's only taught her Greek and Latin, as 'any body can teach her English.'[214] Her mother is correct. Mr Bellamy pointedly ignores her ever-increasing pleas to leave her alone, and 'a carriage constantly at the ready to whisk [her] off […] in the end he succeeds, and carries her away to a forced marriage at Gretna Green.'[215] To return – via Levi-Strauss and Gunner – to the question of inheritance: if Eugenia's predicament is whether bare capital can replace the legitimacy and agency of ordered succession, the answer has to be no. Yet it is not just her economic, but the veneer of social capital, which is seen to be problematic. Doctor Orkborne points out that while he may teach her 'Greek and Latin languages', 'any body can teach her English'. The problem, of course, is that nobody has taught her how to use polite English, and she therefore has no idea how to articulate her desires, let alone to discover – as Evelina and Cecilia have in turn - that women's polite language must always fail. Not only is her own economic capital – like that of Cecilia - shown to be bound to the unpredictable violence of the patriarchal authority which underpins the post-revolutionary status quo, then, but classical learning itself only further signals her socio-biological disability.

While Eugenia finds a happy ending in Bellamy's suicide, it is indelibly associated with another crisis for Camilla, who has been driven mad by the attention and then withdrawal of Edgar's too-scrupulous gaze. As Julia Epstein has suggested, this is driven by an epistolary crisis.[216] But it is also driven by spiralling debts as Camilla's attempts to live up to Edgar's impossible standards drive her family into a debt which ends with her father in debtor's gaol. Secluding herself at an inn – like Cecilia, a site which identifies a loss of social and economic

[213] Burney, *Camilla*, 120.
[214] Burney, *Camilla*, 122.
[215] William Stafford, *English Feminists and Their Opponents in the 1790s: Unsex'd and Proper Females* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002), 79.
[216] Epstein, *The Iron Pen*, 134-5.

capital with a lack of sanity – she attempts to write a final letter to her parents, only for a 'confused, stifled' noise outside:

> an immense crowd of people approaching slowly, and from a distance, towards the inn.
> As they advanced, she was struck to hear no encrease of noise, save from the nearer trampling of feet. No voice was distinguishable; no one spoke louder than the rest; they seemed even to tread the ground with caution. They consisted of labourers, workmen, beggars, women, and children, joined by some accidental passengers: yet the general 'hum of many' was all that was heard; they were silent though numerous, solemn though mixt.
> As they came near, she thought she perceived something in the midst of them like a bier, and caught a glimpse of a gentleman's habit. Startled, she drew in; but soon, upon another view, discerned clearly a well-dressed man, stretched out his full length, and apparently dead.[217]

Peggy speaks of a murder, 'nobody knows who he is, nor who has done it', the body having been found 'in a wood hard by, and one person calling another, and another he had been brought to the inn to be owned.' [218] For Eugenia at least, the identity is good news. Bellamy accidentally shot himself when threatening Eugenia, who had refused to be extorted for her uncle's money. After a brief brush with death herself, Mr Tyrold is freed, Camilla marries Edgar and Eugenia – or so it is hinted – finds a new husband.

Yet while critics have continued to read this – pace Epstein – in broadly psychoanalytic terms, it is both the mob which is seen to restore order and this fact which is so troubling to Camilla. I have previously argued that the gothic shudders in *Camilla* draw on Protestant travel narratives of Catholic Europe in order to tackle the anti-Catholic mode of gothic literature.[219] For example, the procession has clear parallels to a Catholic religious procession, both recounted and fictional. The Dubliner James Murphy's account of an early 1789 trip to Oporto, Portugal, for example, recounts the devotion of the inhabitants:

> Religion seems to be their only pursuit. The clattering of bells, the bustling of processions, and the ejaculations of friars, engage the attention by day, whilst every part resounds by night with the chaunting [sic] of hymns.[220]

[217] Burney, *Camilla*, 868.
[218] Ibid, 869.
[219] Daniel Waterfield, *Catholics and Catholicism in the Novels of Frances Burney,* [Unpublished MA thesis], (University of Liverpool, 2013), 40.
[220] David Higgs, 'The Portuguese Church' in William James Callaghan and David Higgs, eds., *Church and Society in Catholic Europe of the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 51 – 66. 54.

Meanwhile, the reverent silence of the crowd 'they were silent though numerous, solemn though mixt' finds a fictional referent in Matthew Lewis' *The Monk,* (1796). In Lewis, the narrator observes a crowd awaiting the procession in 'universal silence […] every heart was filled with reverence for religion.'[221] In Lewis and Murphy this silence precedes only the gaudy trinkets of a Protestant's vision of Catholicism. Burney may, with a wink and a nod, give us a glimpse of a religious order in 'a gentleman's habit', but it is soon – upon a second glance – transfigured only into a well-dressed man. The spectre of a Catholic procession, then, is replaced by the bourgeois subject. That the mob 'labourers, workmen, beggars, women, and children, joined by some accidental passengers', especially in the wake of the mass violence (so to speak) of the French Revolution and the smallpox contagion encountered at the fair, plays such a critical plot role here however cannot be ignored. Just as it was the encounter with this mob that caused Eugenia's 'deformity', before another encounter caused her to recognise this deformity in herself, the mob here acts as the primary historical force to deliver up her freedom.

The extent to which both the gothic, the mob, and England's fractious religious history are at play here is perhaps best illustrated by Derrida's attempt to define 'hauntology,' best unmasked if we recall that in French, 'hauntolog[ie]' is a near homophone for 'ontologie' :

> Each time is the event itself, a first time is a last time. Altogether other. Staging for the end of history. Let us call it a *hauntology.* This logic of haunting would not be merely larger and more powerful than an ontology or a thinking of being [.] It would harbour within itself, but like circumscribed places or particular effects, eschatology and teleology themselves. It would comprehend them, but incomprehensibly.[222]

As Mark Fisher points out, hauntology was conceptualised in the wake of Fukuyama's declaration of the end (that is telos, in a Hegelian sense) of history: the fall of the Berlin Wall, the dissolution of the USSR, and the apparent triumph of free-market capitalism.[223] History may have reached its ideological culmination, but myriad lost futures still appear as 'ghosts.' As Colin Davis puts it, the Spectre – that of communism haunting Europe, of course – and Hauntology come to figure in Derrida as both presence and absence, ontologies and

[221] Matthew Lewis, *The Monk,* ed. Howard Anderson (Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 2008), 345.
[222] Jacques Derrida, *Spectres of Marx* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), 10.
[223] Mark Fisher, 'What is Hauntology?' *Film Quarterly* Vol. 66, No. 1 (Fall 2012), 16-24, 19.

teleologies unmoored from their material roots, and thus untameable.[224] If Hamlet, to which Derrida refers throughout, 'already began with the expected return of the dead King', then 'after the end of history, the spirit comes by coming back, it figures both a dead man who comes back and a ghost whose expected return repeats itself, again and again.'[225] This, then, is Camilla and Burney's horrific realisation. The horror here is not processional, nor is it purely based in the mob. Rather, Camilla looks out of the inn's window to see both the English Catholic past, its French-Catholic infused present, and the spectre of a Catholic future each present, yet each present-yet-absent on the Imperial landscape. At its heart, however, is the mob. It is the mob, that which is excluded from the sight of polite society, which presents *both* the body of the monk *and* the 'well-dressed' bourgeois, and thus signals its power over both religious and revolutionary violence.

All Camilla can do is look upon Bellamy's body and despair. Having seen the procession, Camilla finishes the letter to her parents, 'not to be delivered till I am dead.' This done, she tries to rest, only to feverishly decide to find the landlady and send the letter immediately. She finds instead 'stretched out upon a large table, the same form, dress, and figure she had seen upon the bier.'[226] Margaret Anne Doody points to the compulsion and 'guilt, horror, and fascination' Camilla feels here as the death of Bellamy means delivery for Eugenia:

> The woman-hater, the woman-destroyer, is dead. Gazing on the corpse of the Male, Camilla gazes at dead law, absence of authority, abstraction, and false names, the (temporary) end of the law of the Father. She enters a short space and time of freedom, signified also in the absence or unreadability of The Book of Common Prayer.[227]

Derrida points out that although beginning *The Communist Manifesto* with the Spectre, 'Marx does not like ghosts any more than his adversaries do. He does not want to believe in them.

---

[224] More fully:

> Hauntology supplants its near-homonym ontology, replacing the priority of being and presence with the figure of the ghost as that which is neither present nor absent, neither dead nor alive. Attending to the ghost is an ethical injunction insofar as it occupies the place of the Levinasian Other: a wholly irrecuperable intrusion in our world, which is not comprehensible within our available intellectual frameworks, but whose otherness we are responsible for preserving.

Colin Davies, 'Etat Present: Hauntology, presence, and spectres' *French Studies*, Vol. LIX, No. 3, 373–379, 373.

[225] Derrida, *Spectres of Marx,* 10.

[226] Burney, *Camilla,* 870.

[227] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 271.

But he thinks of nothing else.' [228] This is Camilla's predicament as she gazes upon the patriarchal anchor of contemporary life, the freedom from which necessitates death and exposes her to terror. She does not wish to prolong her terror but finds herself unable tear her gaze away from the corpse. This then goes back to the core of the novel's predicament: how can we naturalise constitutional legitimacy and inheritance when there has been a fundamental rupture. Camilla here comprehends that we cannot. Only the mob, the fundamental force of post-revolutionary history, can bring forth 'dead law, absence of authority, abstraction, and false names.' Burney here is at her most explicit in her description of the contradictions of the sociable marketplace. The mob reflects the logic of the sociable marketplace writ large in its classlessness, and its appearance brings with it, to return to Derrida and Fisher, the spectre of the histories which the Hanoverian logic of whig history sought to sublimate.

This, in turn, brings us to a new reading of the famous scene of *The Iron Pen* from which Epstein's study takes its name. Having seen the body, and at last able to move, Camilla thinks again of the suffering of her father and prepares for death. She begs for a prayer book to be brought, 'but her eyes, heavy, aching, and dim, glared upon the paper, without distinguishing the print from the margin.'[229] Instead, she calls to Peggy for a clergyman to read and pray with her. This done, she lies in bed and contemplates once more 'the corpse she had just quitted [which] seemed still bleeding in full view.' Soon she is overtaken by a feverish slumber, where 'Death, in a visible figure, ghastly, pallid, severe, appeared before her' and commands her to 'rejoice' for she is about to die:

> Come! write with thy own hand thy claims, thy merits to mercy!' […] She saw the immense volumes of Eternity, and her own hand involuntarily grasped a pen of iron, and with a velocity uncontroulable wrote these words: 'Without resignation, I have prayed for death: from impatience of displeasure, I have desired annihilation: to dry my own eyes, I have left ... pitiless, selfish, unnatural!... a Father the most indulgent, a Mother almost idolizing, to weep out their's!' […] Loud again sounded the same direful voice: 'These are thy deserts; write now thy claims:—and next,—and quick,—turn over the immortal leaves, and read thy doom.... […] The time, she found, was past; she had slighted it while in her power; it would return to her no more; and a thousand voices at once, with awful vibration, answered aloud to every prayer, 'Death was thy own desire!' Again, unlicensed by her will, her hand seized the iron instrument. The book was open that demanded her claims. She wrote with difficulty ... but saw that her pen made no mark!

[228] Derrida, *Spectres*, 57.
[229] Burney, *Camilla*, 873.

It is not difficult to see the figure of Robespierre in the 'ghastly, pallid, severe' figure whose final adjective points to the guillotine. Nor in the 'immortal leaves' the almost infinite illegibility both of Jacobin law and of the BCP which dissolved into pure material. Doody argues that this is the epitome of the fragmentation experienced in the course of the novel.[230] Epstein, meanwhile, in her work centred on 'the iron pen' itself, argues that 'letters, words, sentences' are present here as 'the radical transparency of empty space and blankness.'[231] This points both to Burney's own fear that professional writing would undermine her femininity and that Camilla, for whom letter writing is inextricably bound up with her own status in Edgar's eyes as a collection of debts, recovers muteness as rebellion.[232] These readings are undeniably persuasive. But alongside them we must surely return to the opening words of the novel itself, where Burney sets out her task as a historian. That Camilla's denouement comes about in a scene where she attempts to write herself into history only to find that not only had 'her pen made no mark' but she is faced with 'a thousand voices at once' must be read both as the failure of history to reconcile post-1688 legitimacy and the overwhelming historical power of the mob.

But there is another layer here. Derrida writes both that 'a ghost never dies, it remains always to come, and to come back' and:

> Seismic events come from the future, they are given from out of the unstable, chaotic, and dis-located ground of the times. A disjointed or dis-adjusted time without which there would be neither history, nor event, nor promise of justice.[233]

The shadow of Robespierre and the cult of reason gives the end of history here a different end. Camilla looks upon the dead figure of the law-giver, then pleads for death to take her. Death, however, refuses to countenance her death, and instead her failure to write is accompanied by the voice of the mob, each of which are individual in the mass. What this suggests, then, is both radical and uncertain. Camilla is unable to write history, just as the text and margin of the prayer book refuse to divulge a coherent historical narrative on which to build. After the fall of James II and the rise of the revolutionary mob 'time is out of joint.'

[230] Doody, *Frances Burney*, 272.
[231] Epstein, *The Iron Pen*, 135.
[232] Ibid.
[233] Derrida, *Spectres of Marx*, 123, 214.

But the blood-soaked figure of the male law giver is much more uncertain. If Marx's spectre is a figure of eternal return, if only a return in non-presence and disjointed time, then Camilla's return to the world of the living – and its resulting social organisation – does give scope for historical agency contra-patriarchy, but at the pain of joining her voice with 'a thousand voices' to scream 'Death was thy own desire' to the figure of the male tyrant.

Frances Burney's account of her time among the émigrés at Juniper Hall and her marriage to Alexandre d'Arblay therefore demonstrates a heretofore ignored level of tumult in the British landscape. While the presence of Catholic émigrés offered an opportunity for the Anglican church to demonstrate its superiority through charity, the colonies of ci-devants and the visibility of French Catholic clergy on London streets threatened to unpick an already fragile British state. It is no wonder, then, that *Camilla*'s geography is perhaps the most unsettled so far. Gone are the neat theatres and country homes of *Evelina* and *Cecilia*, here Eugenia is infected in the liminal and anarchic space of a fair in the suburbs. If Madame Duval and Mrs Delvile promised alternate inheritances, then Camilla can only look back as the Revolutionary mob lurks behind every hill.

Camilla is also perhaps the first of Burney's novels to explicitly consider the links of the slave trade to the sociable marketplace. Eugenia's illness, scars, and resulting education and inheritance all show a continuation of Burney's understanding of how women's position as carriers of value in society is incompatible with any chance of agency. Burney again argues that it is folly to expect politeness to grant women a degree of social agency because such politeness is merely a gloss over the capital they represent. More generally, the French Revolution leaves another legacy not just in the presence of the mob but the interrogation of debt. These concerns are not of course particular to the novel, but rather the continuance of the anxieties explored since the 1770s. Indeed, with the sociable marketplace persistently troubling economic and social credit, Frances sees the chance of mass upheaval as not just more likely in Britain but perhaps even inevitable.

Indeed, the mob is perhaps the apotheosis of the promised inclusivity of sociability. In place of the promises of coherency however, the true mass movements only herald an excavation of heretofore submerged and sublimated histories and inter-social conflicts. It is no wonder, then, that the bier scene harks back to the Gordon Riots; the logic of the social marketplace is that of the resurgence of the histories it attempted to repress. That this scene leads to Camilla's inability to write in turn signifies Burney's ultimate rejection of the possibility

raised in the introduction of writing coherent history in the face of this new regime. There is only the prospect of mass protest, and the mob and the threat of violence becomes – just as for Hume – the omnipresent driver of history. Worse than Evelina's attempts to write back, Camilla's inability to write her own destiny only points to Frances' own inability to continue to write in order to live in the face of such a failure of community.

In this context, Burney's engagement with the political philosophy of the French enlightenment must be re-examined. Although there is no space in which to do this in this thesis, both this and the preceding chapters have uncovered a deep fixation not just with questions of legitimacy, but a deeper interrogation of the question of sovereignty and the social contract. Considering the involvement of the Juniper Hall set in constitutionalism – their involvement in which drove Charles' dislike of d'Arblay – this would suggest a heretofore unexamined vein of Burney's engagement with French enlightenment philosophy.

Chapter five: 'She must have written, spoken, thought in French': Race, Gender, and the Marketplace in *The Wanderer* (1814)

Burney's last novel *The Wanderer* (1814) contains her most explicit expression of the difficulties of Anglican Womanhood in the sociable marketplace. In so doing, however, it compares the terror of the French Revolution to the trauma of the Glorious Revolution. With efforts to implement a constitution on the French King explicitly modelled on 1688, *The Wanderer* sees Burney unsettlingly point to the similarities between the mass violence of the terror and the social disorder of the eighteenth century. As the heroine discovers as she struggles to find a place in British society, Britain is in no condition to assert its moral superiority. Both sought to replace a supposedly tyrannical King with limited monarchy, and both caused upheaval in the social order and mass violence.

Burney's contemporary critics understood the awkward parallels. As M.O Grenby has argued, anti-revolutionary critics in the 1800s had developed a method of political criticism through aesthetic complaint, with radical texts such as William Godwin's St Leon (1799) damned for its 'poor literary quality.'[1] Lord Macaulay articulated these fears best when he suggested the isolation of 'ten years at Paris' where she 'must have written, spoken, thought in French' led to a 'sort of broken Johnsonese, a barbarous patois, bearing the same relation to the language of Rasselas which the gibberish of the negroes of Jamaica bears to the English of the House of Lords.'[2] Helen Thompson and Margaret Doody suggest that Croker, Hazlitt, and Macauley all expressed a masculine horror at Burney's attempts to make history out of the weightless events of a woman's life. [3] Joyce Hemlow similarly argued that while her readers expected her to damn Napoleon, something to buoy British hearts, they instead received an examination of 'the difficulties a penniless and unprotected spinster might

[1] M.O Grenby, *The Anti-Jacobin Novel: British Conservatism and the French Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 196.
[2] Thomas Babington Macaulay, 'Madame d'Arblay' in Frances Burney, *The Diaries and Letters of Madame d'Arblay (Frances Burney)* With notes by W.C Ward and prefaced by Lord Macaulay's essay, in three volumes, Vol. 1. (1778 – 1787) (London: Vizetelly & co, 1890), xlvi.
[3] Helen Thompson, 'How *The Wanderer* Works: Reading Burney and Bourdieu', ELH, Vol. 68, No. 4 (Winter, 2001), 965-989, 965; Margaret Anne Doody, *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1988), 318-9.

encounter' with 'strictures […] against English failings […] insularism, pride, and hard-heartedness.'[4] Hemlow is therefore correct. Burney had already attempted to disrupt in *Camilla*, with the narrator's opening discussing the difficulty and poverty of abstract grand narratives against the inscrutability of individuals. Macauley on the other hand, understood that Burney's error was more fundamental. Unable to perform either Englishness or Frenchness, she confuses the two. In so doing, he points to a reading of *The Wanderer* in which British and French regimes are equated. Both, she argues, with a critical nod towards the constitutionalists of Juniper Hall, sought to impose a constitution on a monarch and in so doing led not to a harmonious social order, but decades of social unrest.

Juliet's inability to fit into the British social order repeatedly draws the reader's attention then not to the supremacy of Britain over the tumult in France, but to its similarities. Burney writes an excoriating expose of the economic and social bankruptcy of British society. There is no community here. No stability – whether that of class, race, or gender – is plausible. Just like in France, the elite refuse to honour their debts; women who attempt to use the skills which grant them credit on the marriage market are shunned when the time comes to be paid. Polite identity is nothing more than a confidence trick, and women forever on the verge of prostitution. But this is no defence of the French Revolution, even if she remains sympathetic to the constitutionalists at Juniper Hall. The Terror holds its terror for Burney because she understands that the same mass violence lurks behind the English landscape. To return to Hume, attempts to change the monarch will always lead to mass violence. Britain has only avoided the Terror through repression. The heroine of *The Wanderer* for example is notably insensible to Sir Jaspar's explanation of Britain's historical perfection as he leads her through the collections at Wilton. After experiencing the Revolution, all prospect of historical perfection and reforming of the monarchy is risible. It is only a portrait of Charles I's children that raises her interest, yet also brings with it the spectre of her Jacobin husband. Burney nevertheless concludes her comparison with a strident defence of King, Country, and Church as the Admiral defends a brother Catholic Christian against the Jacobin threat. As she repeatedly argued, the fragility and incoherence of the Hanoverian state has never been a legitimate reason to urge its overthrow. Now, after the French Revolution, she hopes that perhaps a sense of Christian unity can finally be expressed.

[4] Joyce Hemlow, *The History of Fanny Burney,* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), 338.

The arrival of their son firmly anchored the d'Arblays in a Franco-British Catholic milieu. Frances was anxious that Alexander (fils) learn how best to navigate his two inheritances. In 1797, Frances wrote that her 'little man, who is now 3 years old, is perfectly healthy':

> Whatever we say to him, either in French or English, he conceives, with the utmost readiness - you will suppose we do not start any very "difficult solutions", as Mr Dyers said, to him, - however he is so set in shewing his understanding of all we address to him, that M d'A assures me he only delays speaking from a point of filial delicacy, through the fear of offending one parent while he makes choice, for his first language, of the language of the other.[5]

Even before the family moved to Paris in 1802, then, their son's religious and national identity was contested. Just how Frances, in her youth, came to associate the maternal line with that of Catholicism, here she projects on to her infant son similar split loyalties. If she represents Britishness and the English language however, then Alexandre represents the French alternative. As a further letter from 1820 demonstrates, these competing influences also represent Anglicanism vs Catholicism: While his 'father earnestly desired that he follow[ed] that road in which he himself could best lead him forward […] with a generosity nearly unexampled, he left him to his own decision.'[6] In other words, while his father wished for his son to follow the Catholic faith, and Burney implicitly the Anglican identity, the decision their son's alone. This does not just reinforce the sense of religious ambiguity and ecumenicism in Frances' marriage of equals. Religion is not a imposition here akin to the patriarchs of her fiction. Yet the uncertain quality of Alexander's religious and national identity only further points to how these concerns about her son's future remained paramount during her time in France, and her composition of *The Wanderer.*

The opening passage of *The Wanderer* harks back to her pamphlet in support of the émigré French clergy. A small group of 'English passengers', fleeing from France in the wake of the Terror, debate whether to rescue a French Catholic:

> During the dire reign of the terrific Robespierre, and in the dead of night, braving the cold, the darkness and the damps of December, some English passengers, in a small vessel, were preparing to glide silently from the coast of France, when a voice of keen distress resounded from the shore, imploring, in the French language, pity and admission.

[5] Frances Burney to Miss Elphinstone, Jan 14th 1797, MS Hyde 5, Houghton Library Harvard. Alexander was, under G.O Cambridge's direction, to eventually take Holy Orders in the Anglican Church.
[6] Frances Burney d'Arblay to Miss Elphinstone, 31st October 1820, MS Hyde 5, Houghton Library Harvard.

> The pilot quickened his arrangements for sailing; the passengers sought deeper concealment; but no answer was returned.
> 'O hear me!' cried the same voice, 'for the love of Heaven, hear me!'[7]

Her choice of a historical setting, Fiona Scott points out, places the novel within a political and historical discourse of Constitutionalism and Napoleonism.[8] While it has often been argued that *The Wanderer* is a mere rewriting of *Evelina* then, this criticism ignores her sustained pro-Catholic sympathies and with Burney's wider engagement with constitutional legitimacy.[9] Focussing on her final work as full of Catholic sympathy supposedly lacking in her first, not only does it fundamentally misread Burney, but ignores the novelty of *The Wanderer*. Her final work prompts the reader to question whether they would have returned to danger to rescue a fellow Christian. Indeed, whether they would have seen a francophone appeal to 'the love of Heaven' as a marker of shared Christianity in the face of a jacobin threat. In asking the question, however, Burney begins to unsettle the certainties of Anglican superiority.

It is the sailor who reminds the passengers of their British duty. The 'old sea pilot' argues that a 'woman, a child, and a fallen enemy, are three persons that every true Briton should scorn to misuse.'[10] Patriarchal authority wins out, and when they are certain all chance of capture is behind them, the passengers begin to discuss the new arrival as if they remained in the enlightenment salons of Paris:

> 'I wonder what sort of a dulcinea you have brought amongst us! though, I really believe, you are such a complete knight-errant, that you would just as willingly find her a tawny Hottentot as a fair Circassian. She affords us, however, the vivifying food of conjecture,—the only nourishment of which I never sicken!—I am glad, therefore, that 'tis dark, for discovery is almost always disappointment.'[11]

---

[7] Frances Burney, *The Wanderer*, eds. Peter Sabor and Margaret Anne Doody (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 11.
[8] Fiona Price, "The End of History?: Scott, His Precursors and the Violent Past." *Reinventing Liberty: Nation, Commerce and the British Historical Novel from Walpole to Scott* (Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2016), 170–206, 171.
[9] Leanne Maunu argues that while *Evelina* shows the French as monstrous at worst and fools at best, *The Wanderer* turns the gaze on to British society. This is controversial, especially considering that Madame Duval's excesses, even in a flat reading, remain that of a Briton poisoned by French fashions. Where Manau is useful is in drawing attention to Burney's heretofore ignored involvement with British nationalisms.
Leanne Manau *Women Writing the Nation: National Identity, Female Community, and the British French Connection, 1770 – 1820* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2007), 41.
[10] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 12.
[11] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 12-3.

It is telling that the possibility of asking the traveller directly never occurs. She is nothing but the latest trinket to be added to the ladies' collections, less a person than a relic. Burney here satirises both enlightenment salons of pre-Revolutionary Paris and the Bluestocking sets which had drawn her wit during the last century. They are not interested in 'discovery', only 'conjecture', because full enlightenment only breeds 'disappointment.' In turn, Burney suggests more radically that the enlightenment project of both England and France are more interested in tumult and uncertainty than rational scientific advance. The question of whether she is a 'tawny Hottentot' or a 'fair Circassian' is less important than the fact she is yet another object for their edification.

Burney therefore suggests that the disorder engendered by the French Revolution was in no sense a novel. For Dror Wahrman the *ancien regime* conception of identity was contextual.[12] Wahrman especially pointed to the role of the American War of Independence as a time when 'Britons mobilised practically every category of difference imaginable' to rationalise what was 'perhaps [a] civil war' into a conflict against a 'stable other.'[13] Wahrman goes on to throw the blame for the tumult of the Gordon Riots and the 'notorious elections of 1784' squarely at the feet of the American Revolution.[14] Charles James Fox, writing to Lord Holland at the outbreak of war with France in 1793, pointedly described how 'we live in times of violence and extremes.'[15] Fox sees in the French Revolutionary war a new and profound shift, one that – he laments – gave the British Monarchy the confidence to consolidate its power against the threat of anarchy. Yet the prospect of racial disintegration and slavery is not new. Though it found its most explicit expression in Burney's fears that her husband would be sent to the West Indies and Eugenia's guinea-sized smallpox scars, it had always been a lingering prospect for the social disorders and inversions described in the wake of 1688. To go further, the ladies' discussions of their new passenger – and their denial of subjectivity – follows the logic of the polite spaces she so thoroughly excoriated. If identity was nothing more than a social, commercial imposition – then the boundaries of racial and biological difference were similarly contested.

[12] Dror Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004), 168.
[13]Wahrman, *The Making…,* 246
[14] Wahrman, *The Making…* 263.
[15] Charles James Fox to Lord Holland, December 1793, quoted in Wahrman, *The Making…,* 149.

The ladies' salon on the boat therefore satirises both French and Hanoverian attempts to create a rational, unified state. Taking place during the 'dire reign of the terrific Robespierre', *The Wanderer* is set at the peak of social breakdown. The beginning of the Terror is debateable, but often placed somewhere among the Fall of Toulon to the English on 27th August 1793, the beginning of the September Massacres after the fall of Verdun on 2nd September, and the proclamation of the Law of Suspects at the National Convention on 5th September.[16] The fall is generally agreed to be marked with Robespierre's denunciation on 9 Thermidor Year II (27th July 1794), his arrest with that of his faction that night, and their guillotining the next morning. Concurrent to The Terror was the rise of the Cult of Reason, a profound dechristianisation spearheaded by Robespierre to replace the foundational Catholicism of the pre-Revolutionary state.[17] As David A. Bell points out, however, 'the architects of the festivals, [were also] the architects of nationalism in France', and were not 'acting on behalf of god, not even a god dressed up in the clothes of the Nation,' but rather sought to instil a new praxis to unify a disparate population into a nation.[18] The unknown woman's escape is not just an escape into a new identity but marked the most frenetic phase of revolutionary nation building. In other words, her unstable, unraced, and perhaps even unsexed body marks the radical unravelling of the state apparatus. With this unravelling taking place among the English ladies however, and with their language echoing not only those of the Bluestockings but also the polite women Burney has critiqued, Burney draws an unsettling parallels between the rationalism of moderate Anglicanism and the cult of reason which drove the worst of the French Revolutionaries.

Refusal to participate in the polite conversation disrupts her race. The young woman bats away more questions regarding the possibility of contacts in England and any history in France. She 'arrange[s] an old shawl' to reveal:

> hands and arms of so dark a colour, that they might rather be styled black than brown. Elinor exultingly drew upon them the eyes of Harleigh [and they] perceived it to be of an equally dusky hue.
> The look of triumph was now repeated.

[16] Mona Ozouf, 'War and Terror in French Revolutionary Discourse (1792 – 1794)', *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 56, No. 4 (Dec. 1984), 579-597, 588-9.
[17] Simon Schama, *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution* (London: Penguin, 1989), 656-9; 167; Jonathan Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650 – 1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 716-17.
[18] David A. Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France, Inventing Nationalism 1680 – 1800* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003),167-8.

> 'Pray, Mistress,' exclaimed Mr Riley, scoffingly fixing his eyes upon her arms, 'what part of the world might you come from? The settlements in the West Indies? or somewhere off the coast of Africa?'[19]

Her refusal to answer their questions does not just cause her, like Burney in the coach with Guiffardiere, to be suspected of Catholicism, atheism, or treason. The darkness of the boat is marked on her 'hands and arms of so dark a colour' that in turn mark her as a refugee slave. The subject of capital rather than its master, she must therefore be an escapee from the plantations either before or after her escape. Yet because this passage is a satirical attack on the shared preconceptions of British and French enlightenment, Burney here launches a much wider attack on the ladies' logic. Since they are unable to see the young lady in the darkness of the night, all this remains mere conjecture; the black skin which marks her servitude and racial Otherness turns out to be a product of the ladies' discussion.

Burney finds the colonial mobility and unrest of the Revolutionary period to be profoundly unsettling. As C.A Bayly reminds us, the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, 'rather than simply European or American History,' took part in a global theatre.[20] After the loss of the thirteen colonies, anti-slavery sentiment in Britain began to formalise. Mass petitions began to arrive at parliament in 1788, and William Wilberforce addressed the commons in the first anti-slavery debate one year later. By 1792, 500 petitions from all around the country were delivered. These petitions began in the centenary of the Glorious Revolution, and this attitude helped foment moral superiority against the French Revolution.[21] Meanwhile, Freetown, in present day Sierra Leone – founded as a refuge for black loyalists in the wake of the loss of the American colonies and which sat uneasily with slave trading posts nearby – was attacked by French forces in September 1794, despite local protestations of their independence.[22] Across the Atlantic, pressures were similarly high. Slave uprisings in the French West Indies in 1791, stymied the availability of sugar and coffee thus affecting the material environment in which Anglican Womanhood depended.[23] The most famous example is on St Domingue, where a Revolution directly inspired by the ideals of the French Revolution rocked the island

[19] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 19.
[20] C.A. Bayly, 'The "Revolutionary Age" in the wider world,' in Richard Bessel, Nicholas Guyatt, and Jane Rendall, eds. *War, Empire, and Slavery*, 1770 – 1830 (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010), 21-43, 21.
[21] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707 – 1837* (London: Vintage, 1996). 374 – 6.
[22] Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty's Exiles: The Loss of America and the Remaking of the British Empire* (London: Harper Collins, 2011), 300-1.
[23] Schama, *Citizens*, 510.

from 1791.[24] Both C.L.R James and Phillipe Girard highlight the international, Atlantic outlook of Toussaint Louverture, with Girard in particular pointing to Louverture's need to ally with the British Navy to keep food supplies open while avoiding alienating the French.[25] His long career saw him fight first as rebel, then as a member of the Spanish Army, repel a British invasion, and even warn the Jamaican white population against French plans for a slave revolt.[26] Discussion of racial difference here then is inextricable from the material and colonial conditions which permeate enlightened spaces. Burney refuses to disentangle polite from revolutionary rhetoric in assigning blame for slavery. But while she was profoundly anti-Slavery, she nevertheless understood the prospect of international travel and commerce as risking a much deeper breakdown analogous to the mass violence of the 17th and late 18th centuries.[27]

Again, Burney's anxieties rest on her worry that any disruption to the material culture of British national identity risks a much wider breakdown in the social order. This can be seen in the passengers' attempts to read the refugee's clothes for evidence of her political allegiances. Like Captain Duval, such search for the proofs of material culture is explicit:

> The wind just then blowing back the prominent borders of a French night-cap, which had almost concealed all her features, displayed a large black patch, that covered half her left cheek, and a broad black ribbon, which bound a bandage of cloth over the right side of her forehead.
> Before Elinor could utter her rallying congratulations to Harleigh, upon this sight, she was stopt by a loud shout from Mr Riley; 'Why I am afraid the demoiselle has been in the wars!' cried he. 'Why, Mistress, have you been trying your skill at fisty cuffs for the good of your nation? or only playing with kittens for your private diversion?'
> 'Now, then, Harleigh,' said Elinor, 'what says your quixotism now? Are you to become enamoured with those plaisters and patches, too?'[28]

[24] Jasanoff, *Liberty's Exiles,* 268.
[25] C.L.R James, *The Black Jacobins* (London: Penguin, 1938, 2001). 73-5; Phillipe R. Girard, 'Black Talleyrand: Toussaint Louverture's Diplomacy, 1798-1802' *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 66, No. 1 (Jan., 2009), 87-124, 90 – 92.
[26] Carolyn Fick, 'Revolutionary Saint Domingue and the Emerging Atlantic: Paradigms of Sovereignty' *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* Vol. 31, No. 2, The Second Slavery: Mass Slavery, World-Economy, and Comparative Microhistories, Part I (2008), 121-144, 122-5; Girard, 'Black Talleyrand,' 92.
[27] Burney first met Wilberforce on her return to England in 1812. Harman notes that they spoke for four hours, with Burney praising it as some of the 'best conversation' she had ever had. Claire Harman, *Fanny Burney: A Biography*, (London: Flamingo, 2001), 314-5; Joyce Hemlow puts the date of the meeting in September 1813, and similarly highlights the strong religious content in their engaged conversation. Hemlow, *The History…,* 332.
[28] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 19-20.

19th century critics' lament that *The Wanderer* was a mere rewriting of her earlier work is perhaps pertinent. Just as Evelina went to the milliner, so too do the passengers seek to create the mute passenger's identity in ordering and classifying her body and clothes. Under 'a french nightcap' is revealed 'a large black patch' which sits uneasily against the undefined colour of her skin. But it is the 'broad black ribbon' which is most interesting. Nicola Shilliam points out that in the material language of the French Revolution, black cockades 'were thought to suggest anti-revolutionary or pro-monarchy sympathies.'[29] It could equally, of course, indicate mourning for the recently guillotined King.[30] Either way, the proximity of such politicised clothing next to her dangerously unstable skin and the 'bandage of cloth' that generates questions of her participation 'in the wars' furthers a complex relationship between territory, allegiance, and race; all were inextricable from the material contexts of their production. There is therefore an awkward tension in these passages between Burney's understanding of racial difference as sociologically constructed and therefore dangerously mutable, and enlightenment attempts to discover a true and immutable core identity. The maritime's attempts to divine the 'core' identity of the passenger, Burney argues, are therefore in fact attempts to assert that identity on the mute passenger.

The relationship between biology, climate, material culture, and race would have been particularly pertinent to the d'Arblay family. In the aftermath of the overthrow of the directory and rise of Napoleon, d'Arblay's hopes that he might recover his property were intensified by his removal from the list of proscribed emigres.[31] Though these were soon dashed, a contact close to Napoleon raised the prospect of military service. Such half-pay, on which Burney's brother had languished for years, nevertheless presented the family's best chance of financial stability. No longer at risk of summary execution, he set out for Paris. He soon ran into difficulties. As his correspondence with Berthier, Napoleon's Chief of Staff, indicates, questions arose over whether he had indeed satisfied the 25 years of service required for *retraite*.[32] There were, of course, exceptions: Narbonne inter alia had such difficulties smoothed over. But d'Arblay was informed that he would have to serve 'at least one campaign before he could be paid for ci-devant services.'[33] There was another problem:

[29] Nicola J. Shilliam, '"Cocardes Nationales and Bonnets Rouges": Symbolic Headdresses of the French Revolution' *Journal of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston*, Vol. 5 (1993), 104-131, 111-2.
[30] Katrina Navickas, '"That sash will hang you": Political Clothing and Adornment in England, 1780—1840, *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 3 (July 2010), 540-565, 548.
[31] Harman, *Fanny Burney,* 287,
[32] Alexandre d'Arblay to Berthier, Oct – December 1801, Berg Coll MSS Arblay III/54, NYPL.
[33] Harman, *Fanny Burney,* 294.

his refusal to take up arms against his host country. He agrees 'aller a St Domingue aider a faire rentrer cette colonie dans l'ordre', but 'demande la permission de ne point accepter' should combat with the British should arise, since:

> determine de meme a ne jamais m'armer contre la patrie de mon epouse, contre le pays qui pendant 9 ans nous a nourris, je vous jure sur tout la reste fidelite et devousment.[34]

This was hopelessly naïve. That England has given him refuge 'qui pendant 9 ans nous a nourris' and a family, therefore means he owes a debt to 'la patrie de mon epouse.' Just as Camilla and Indiana are beset with the problem of inheritance, so too is this correspondence inextricable from wider questions of nationality's relationship to allegiance and territory. D'Arblay's attempt to articulate a narrative of twenty-five years of uninterrupted service is concurrently an attempt to prove his continuing French identity despite the breakdown of the *ancien regime* which he served, and his banishment from the new French state and its struggle for control of the country. Alexandre is thus caught between the requirement to suggest that there has been no change in legitimacy between *ancien regime*, Directory, and Napoleonic France, and to rationalise the debt to a country which welcomed him at a time when his French nationality had lacked the royal state to which it had been affixed. His attempts to argue that he remains French despite his long years in England while nevertheless arguing that the passage of that time has created a loyalty to 'la patrie de mon epouse' reflects, therefore, the wider racial anxieties of the passage in *The Wanderer*.

Burney clearly worried about the prospect of her own national and racial mutability as she strives to reassure the Royal family that their loyalties are to the British crown. Her relief when he is promptly told that 'they will listen […] to no *conditions* in his service,' is palpable in her swearing to Esther Burney that 'I must have *buried myself alive*, had a new war broken out,' and he had been forced to command 'an expedition against this country.' Despite 'the ease & peace which now result' Burney still fears her that her husband might be called up anyway, not just the dominance over 'probably ill-used Africans, but the risks of the stormy climate':

---

[34] Alexandre d'Arblay to Napoleon Bonaparte 10 Feb 1802, 1/199.
> [I have] Determined to never bear arms against the country of my wife, against the country which for nine years has sustained us, I swear to you on all the other matters faithfulness and devotion.

> & the far greater risks of the pestilential climate—for such, to bilious constitutions, it generally proves—Yet—I dare not feel even now secure—as he waits upon the spot, to see if they will change, & determines there to abide for a year!—
> […]
> *Five Artillery Superior Officers* are at this Moment demanded from the first Consul by the Commander in Chief at St. Domingo!— —I may too easily be alarmed—but who, after What has twice happened [sic] to me within 2 Months, upon a subject so close to my *vitals,* can wonder I shall be ill at rest till St.Domingo is subdued?—[35]

No wonder, when the prospect of his commission was still tangible, Burney felt forced to write to Queen Charlotte regarding the necessity of her husband's commission, and to reassure her that 'nothing on earth' could induce d'Arblay to take up arms against the Country which had given him asylum, & birth to his wife & Child.'[36] By virtue of marriage and couverture, she fears that not only could his nationality crystallise through war service, but she could herself become alienated from Britain – and lose her pension - by virtue of his establishment under Napoleonic France. In turn, her correspondence with the Queen points to a new way of coping with social tumult. Frances and her husband's race and identity are not dependent wholly on Alexandre's nationality or patriarchal protection, but rather depend on Frances' own personal connection with the Queen and princesses.

This strategy is inextricable from her wider understanding of racial mutability. Though she speaks of the ethical problems inherent in putting down the slave revolt, it is thoughts of 'the risks of the stormy Voyage, & the far greater risks of the pestilential climate—for such, to bilious constitutions, it generally proves' that she fears. These fears of infections were well founded. As Kate Chisholm notes, of 34,000 French troops sent to St Domingue, barely 10,000 were left alive one year later. Fever had been a constant plague for colonial expansion in the West Indies, and one that the rebels knew could work well to their advantage.[37] As J.R MacNeill argues, during the 1794 British-Spanish Campaign in St Domingue, the British lost some 50,000 men, 'the majority falling to yellow fever.' When the British eventually gave up, Napoleon's attempt to subdue Toussaint with 58,000 men under the command of his brother in law saw 50,000 soldiers die as Toussaint avoided direct confrontation and waited

[35] Frances Burney d'Arblay to Esther Burney, 22 March 1802, in Joyce Hemlow, ed. *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay),* Vol. 5: West Humble and Paris 1801 – 3, (Oxford: OUP, 1975, 2014), Letter 494.
[36] Frances Burney d'Arblay to Margaret Planta, 11 February 1802, in Joyce Hemlow, ed. *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay),* Vol. 5: West Humble and Paris 1801 – 3, (Oxford: OUP, 1975, 2014), Letter 478.
[37] Kate Chisholm, *Fanny Burney: Her Life,* (London: Vintage, 1999), 199.

for fever to do its work. 'Toussaint and Dessalines would have been poor commanders indeed not to shape their strategy to exploit the overwhelming power of their insect and viral allies.'[38] Just as Eugenia's exposure to the smallpox represented the effect of a breakdown of social order and the tumult of the mob, so too does the fear of fever here signal Burney's fear that racial difference is fundamentally fragile. Plague and infection were therefore not just weapons of war, but inextricably bound up with to the question of race and citizenship. The loss of the great chain of being has not just plagued Britain with the threat of violence then, but in its anchoring of identity to behaviour, commerce, and material culture threatened to reveal a more dangerous mutability.

The essentialist racial discourse among the émigré English passengers therefore sits at odds with Burney's sociological and climactic understanding of race. Until the eighteenth-century naturalists such as the Comte de Buffon argued for the predominance of 'social and physical environment' and therefore as Nicholas Guyatt points out '"Race" was not an essential category but a consequence of experience.' [39] The talk of constitutions, and vitals that pepper Burney's letter are, as ever, instructive. Indeed, they become illuminating as we remember how the young woman of *The Wanderer*'s profoundly mutable race is linked to the wars. The worst thing that could happen to d'Arblay, then not that he might die, but that repeated exposure to the West Indies might unpick first the family's nation, and then their place in the racial hierarchy. Juliet/Ellis's struggle from racial ambiguity to assimilate into White Anglican Womanhood in *The Wanderer* in turn reflects the extent to which Burney continued to understand race, identity, and nationality in mutable terms. This is tantamount to a rejection of the doctrine of immutable racial difference and therefore an intrinsic racial hierarchy. Yet because polite spaces and sociable marketplaces are unable to create stable social order, disease does not just threaten death metaphorically and literally threatens to mutate polite bodies into a racial other. In more abstract terms, disease acts as a metaphor for the transformation undergone when individuals are exposed to sites of exchange, religious violence, or colonisation without the appropriate social gloss. Once they see the violence which underpins polite society they can no longer be inoculated, and instead risk spreading the infection to others. In this way then, discourses of infection and race in *The Wanderer*

[38] J.R McNeill, 'Yellow Jack and Geopolitics: Environment, Epidemics, and the Struggles for Empire in the American Tropics, 1640-1830' *Review (Fernand Braudel Center),* Vol. 27, No. 4, The Environment and World History (2004), 343-364, 358-9.
[39] Nicholas Guyatt, *Bind Us Apart: How Enlightened Americans Invented Racial Segregation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 22.

must be seen as an extension of the arbitrary imposition of nationality on families seen in *Evelina*.

Once discussion of her race is over, the question returns to Catholicism. This is discussed in the same tones of polite fascination as her ambiguous race:

> 'She seems to be at prayers.'
> 'At prayers? She's a nun, then, depend upon it. Make her tell us the history of her convent.'
> [S]he gently approached an elderly lady, who was on her other side, but who, shrinking from her, called out, 'Mr Harleigh, I shall be obliged to you if you will change places with me.'
> 'Willingly;' he answered; but the young lady with whom he had been conversing, holding his coat, exclaimed, 'Now you want to have all the stories of those monks and abbesses to yourself! I won't let you stir, I am resolved!'
> The stranger begged that she might not incommode any one; and drew back.[40]

Epstein finds a gothic shudder in the revolutionary terror, embodied in the revolutionary husband she has fled.[41] Yet here, the cultural milieu is also profoundly intertextual. The English passengers see the young woman 'at prayers' and decide she must be 'a nun, then.' Far from being an object of fear, however, she is seen to be a valuable cultural artefact, one who might – if they are lucky – 'tell us the history of her convent', and whose 'stories of those monks and abbesses' is something to be hoarded against the Jacobin darkness. In other words, and as I have argued previously, the passengers are fully invested in the late eighteenth-century craze for gothic novels.[42] It is the old man who articulates an older cultural gloss, commenting after she refuses Harleigh's offer of a coat that 'I believe in my conscience those outlandish gentry have no more feeling without than they have within!'[43] It is no wonder that 'Encreasing[sic] coldness and darkness repressed all further spirit of conversation.' In contrast to the inclusive, interested language of the rest of the passengers who view their passenger as a novel messenger whose fresh stories will provide excellent currency in their English social circles, the old man uses an older language of religious difference. His 'conscience' marks out a tentatively protestant dissent against a potentially Jacobite sympathiser. Indeed, the use of 'outlandish' was a 'pointed adjective' which was, in

[40] Burney, *Camilla*, 13.
[41] Julia Epstein, *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing* (Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 176-7.
[42] Daniel Waterfield, 'Catholics and Catholicism in the Novels of Frances Burney,' *Unpublished MA Thesis*, (Liverpool: University of Liverpool, 2014), 50.
[43] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 14.

the Gordon Riots, yelled alongside 'popery, popish, and papist.'[44] The threat of religious violence is still within living memory, punctuating and being perpetuated by the politer narratives of gothic terror.

Yet Burney refuses to let the old man's voice go unanswered. When an argument breaks out upon Juliet throwing something overboard, it is the naval officer who makes a broad appeal to Christian unity:

> I speak of us in a body, Madam, and, I hope, with proper shame! To think that we should all get out of that loathsome captivity, with so little reverence, that not one amongst us should have fallen upon his knees, to give thanks, except just this poor outlandish gentlewoman; whose good example I recommend it to us all now to follow.'[45]

Mr Riley, somewhat sardonically, labels him 'a fine fellow, noble Admiral' for 'risk[ing] derision, even from fools.' Mrs Maple 'protest[s]' that she could not bear the 'parade of saying her prayers in public.' This last comment points to the religious discourse at play here in its reference to public idolatry versus private devotion. The Admiral then points to the 'outlandish gentlewoman' as an exemplar 'whose good example I recommend' to the implicitly Protestant-Anglican passengers. But the reference to the virtues of Catholic piety do not end there. In response to Mr Riley's disgust at the prospect of unity in the face of the guillotine, the Admiral again 'speak[s] of us as a body', appealing to the unity of Christian identity and distinguishing only in the degrees of 'devotion.' 'Shaking the boat', then, is 'a poor reason' to disturb 'our gratitude […] to the author of all things.' In other words, Mr Riley and Mrs Maple's attempts to re-assert religious difference fail against the religious and military authority of the admiral as he asserts the fundamental unity of Christian belief. In so doing, the Admiral's naval metaphors also defend the possibility of ecumenical British identity in the face of the Jacobin threat.

Yet despite the formative attempts to locate this 'outlandish gentlewoman' within the context of the English Catholic gentry and their diaspora, she remains stubbornly illegible. As soon as she is in the boat, Mrs Maple and her niece demand to know whether 'you lived in any

---

[44] Colin Haydon '"I love my king and my country, but a Roman Catholic I hate": Anti-Catholicism, Xenophobia and National Identity in Eighteenth-Century England.' in Tony Claydon and Ian McBride (Eds.) *Protestantism and National Identity*: *Britain and Ireland, c1650 – 1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 33 – 52, 39.
[45] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 14.

English family? If you have, I should be glad to know their names.' 'Ay, their names! their names!' was echoed from Mrs Maple by her niece.' Yet despite their repeated best efforts to create the fragments of a social identity, she refuses to give any information. Indeed, it takes another fifty pages for her to consent even to the pseudonym 'Ellis.' Burney has a long tradition of pointing to the trans-national nature of gentry identity and the instability of coherent female identity in the eighteenth century, particularly through pointed use of bilingual surnames. As Barbara Zonitch has argued, withholding her name and family background 'challeng[es] the most the most basic assumptions of a patrilineal culture.' While in announcing a Franco-British 'essential, independent female identity' in 'Ellis' she 'is claiming possession of herself':

> To those who attempt to uphold the status quo, Ellis/Juliet is connected with class instability, the colonized, and the potentially threatening, unassimilable, other. As one aristocrat exclaims in frustration, Juliet's namelessness makes her '[i]indefinable, unconquerable, [and] unfathomable [WE, 629]. [46]

While Zonitch is correct to identify Ellis/Juliet with 'class instability, the colonized, and the […] other', in her 'possession of herself out of all male-dominated familial structures', this needs expanding. There is, of course, a link both to Burney's own Franco-British identity in her new moniker of Frances d'Arblay. But Ellis' refusal, or indeed inability, to place herself in the context of English Families who might vouch for English Catholics or French refugees points to the negation at the heart of her identity. If the émigré clergy could at least refer themselves, if not to a state that no longer existed, at least to a stable Catholic church and faith, then Ellis can do neither. While Evelina's problem was that she had a father who 'would not own her,' Ellis' is that she has a husband whose ownership of her is at the heart of her self-negation. Her abjection is both continual and self-willed.[47] While such abjection frees her from the claims of her husband however, this comes at the expense of any reference with which to anchor herself in contemporary British society.

The impossibility of independence becomes apparent once they reach British shores. When all the passengers are safely on land, the pilot demands 'a recompense for the risk which he

[46] Barbara Zonitch *Familiar Violence: Gender and Social Upheaval in the Novels of Frances Burney* (London: University of Delaware Press, 1997), 117, 121-2.
[47] For a definition of abjection, see Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, Trans. Leon S. Roudiez, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 9, 15.

had run in saving her life.' Ellis goes to pay, only for the Admiral to refuse and order the pilot to come to the inn, where he will be repaid 'for her and the rest of us, in a lump.' Ellis protests she has 'no claim' for such kindness, only for the admiral to reply that he would 'be ashamed to be an Englishman' to abandon an 'an unprotected female […] of a good behaviour'

> And a man who could bring himself to be ashamed of being an Englishman, would find it a difficult solution, let me tell you, my good gentlewoman, to discover what he might glory in. However, don't think that I say this to affront you as a foreigner, for I hope I am a better Christian. I only drop it as a matter of fact.[48]

Yet if the admiral stands as a qualified figure of Christian masculinity as an Englishman – able to step - outside of Britishness for Burney, Mrs Maple represents a harsher model. In the inn, she rejects Ellis' presence in their midst, suggesting instead 'that body stay in the kitchen.' Mrs Maple argues that a woman without a social network with which her identity could be grounded and constructed, without any reference to act as referees for her character and social status, is nothing more than 'a body' whose natural abode is, at best, among the servants. The sociable marketplace and the polite spaces within are predicated on social and economic capital. Ellis has no inheritance, nor does she have a Mrs Mirvan to vouch for her. Despite the Admiral's offer however, Burney is under no illusions about the idealised masculinity on offer here. The Admiral repeats his identification of the woman as an English Catholic who perhaps last spoke her 'mother-tongue' as a 'lisping' infant and re-iterates an ecumenical Christian duty. Yet while he intends to reassure her with his statement that 'An unprotected female, provided she's of a good behaviour, has always a claim to a man's care', it is anything but reassuring, and not just because it seems to be predicated on both exclusion from the masculine spheres of 'friend or foe' and contingent on 'good behaviour.' This 'claim to a man's care' is not, as he would have it, a quality that invests any agency in the woman. It is always dependent on a patriarchal whim. It is no accident that these claims collide the moment she steps onto English soil, as Burney draw's the reader's attention to the contingent and socially constructed nature of the claims upon the woman's body and its slow crystallisation.

[48] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 22-3.

As Mrs Maple reminds her, there is no real choice here. The Admiral leaves her with a promise to help her to her friends.[49] Soon after, at the inn, Harleigh finds her 'in evident disorder.'[50] The Admiral comments 'a woman can be but a woman,' and offers to 'send your own countryman to you,' an offer warmly refused. Mrs Maple, however, pointedly 'catching the contagion of curiosity, had deigned to listen' summons the landlord and threatens her with imprisonment. Both the Admiral and Harleigh 'declared the person in that room to be under their protection,' an offer which causes Mr Maple to decry the failures of 'a sea officer, and an Admiral' to 'safeguard, to take part, with our native enemy […] a spy for our destruction!'[51] Ellis, seeing no other way out, opens the door and claims the protection of Harleigh and the Admiral. Mrs Maple demonstrates a patriarchal model of Womanhood. If there is no obvious male relation, then a woman must 'belong' to the nearest 'countryman', against whom her integrity can be tested. To refuse is to place oneself fundamentally outside the sociable spaces which generate nationality and identity. Indeed, a woman who attempts to conceal her own identity in an act of radical self-concealment from the formative social gaze can only be 'a spy for our own destruction.' In a way, Mrs Maple is correct. Ellis' radical subjectivity denies the right of the patriarchal gaze to mould and delineate womanhood. To return to Frances' refusal to answer Rev. Guiffardiere's questions in the carriage, this would be considered morally suspicious at best, and treasonous at worst. Indeed, the Admiral sneeringly suggests that while 'A lady […] must have liberty' of speech, such liberty is a fundamentally suspicious thing, linked to British Protestant and French Revolutionary ideals. Mrs Maple's 'liberty' of speech is easily overthrown by the sheer force of the admiral and Harleigh, who easily overpower the landlord and then place Ellis under their protection. While Mrs Maple's 'liberty' of speech thus tends towards a *French* autocracy in her summary imprisonment, then, Burney refuses to let the male British liberty triumph uncontested. Indeed, for Ellis, her 'liberty' of behaviour, already qualified to her by the Admiral as contingent on 'good behaviour', is a choice between the patriarchal surveillance of Anglican Womanhood and another form of imprisonment.

[50] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 24.
[51] Ibid.

Mrs Maple, indeed, seems to have fallen into the trap of believing that the separate spheres of anti-Jacobin society grants her meaningful 'liberty.' Earlier in the argument, the Admiral complains that:

> though a devil of a wound has put me on the superannuated list I am not sunk into quite such a fair weather chap, as to make over my authority, in such a little pitiful skiff's company as this, to petticoat government; though no man has a better respect for the sex, in its proper element; which, however, is not the sea. Therefore, Madam,' turning to Mrs Maple, 'this gentlewoman being my own passenger, and having comported herself without any offence either to God or man, I shall take it kind if you will treat her in a more Christian-like manner.'[52]

It is little wonder that critics have repeatedly seen Admiral Powel as a rewriting of Captain Mirvan.[53] Yet while Captain Mirvan announced his intention to 'retire to the country, and sink into fair weather chap', the Admiral treats such a prospect with disgust, allying it with 'mak[ing] over my authority […] to petticoat government.'[54] Though comparing the Admiral's rather more generous demeanour to the brutish Captain Mirvan, one cannot help but notice the irony in the reversal. Where Mirvan looks forward to rural leisure and laisser-faire while practicing cruel brutality, it is the Admiral who performs 'fair weather' attitudes while disavowing them.[55] As Julian Fung rightly points out, the Admiral is a 'satiric' character, who deserves to be placed alongside other 'flawed and dangerous' men throughout her fiction.[56] Consider, for example, his reference to 'petticoat government.' As Tamara Hunt points out, the claim of Petticoat Government found new intensity in the eighteenth century, first with regards to the Dowager Princess of Wales, then the influence of Bute on the young George III, and finally the famous example of the Duchess of Devonshire on Charles James

---

[52] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 24.
[53] Brian McCrea, *Frances Burney and Narrative Prior to Ideology* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013), 101.;
Leanne Maunu *Women Writing the Nation: National Identity, Female Community, and The British French Connection, 1770 – 1820* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2007), 215;
Hester Davenport, 'Fanny Goes Dipping – Evelina Does Not: Burney's Attitude to the Pursuit of Sea Bathing in her Life and Writings' in Lorna J. Clark, ed. *A Celebration of Frances Burney* (Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007), 158 – 170, 168.;
Kathleen M. Twidale, *Sensibility in Frances Burney's Novels,* [Unpublished PhD Thesis] University of Adelaide, July 1994, 155.
[54] Frances Burney, *Evelina* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 40.;
Frances Burney, *The Wanderer,* 24.
[55] See note to page 40, Vivian Jones, Introduction and notes, in Burney, *Evelina*, 419.
[56] Julian Fung, 'Fanny Burney as Satirist', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 106, No. 4 (October 2011), 937-953, 950.

Fox.[57] More interestingly, as Philip Hicks points out, the charge of petticoat politics carried with it a distinctly French gloss. For Britons, it was 'an import from the French court, where female influence, sexual immorality, and political corruption were thought to go hand in hand.'[58] Yet this charge of petticoat government is levelled against an arch anti-Jacobin. The Admiral thus collapses the separate spheres of gender influence so beloved of anti-Jacobin conservative writers. Moreover, he inverts it, allying the conservative Mrs Maple with the Jacobin autocracy she has been instructed to work against. The Admiral, in welcoming the dangerously Catholic, racially unstable, stranger, thus only further signals the unpredictable contingency of patriarchal violence.

Unsurprisingly, *The Wanderer* reflects many of Frances' own fears about her time in France. Her husband's sojourn in France would not end with his refusal to serve against the English. One of the conditions of his exit passport from England had been a ban from re-entering the country for at least a year.[59] With the peace of Amiens holding, he was eager for his wife and son to join him as soon as possible. It was to be Frances' first trip out of England, and her experience of the crossing was marred by 'a sickness without a moment's intermission, that

[57] Tamara L. Hunt, *Defining John Bull: Political Caricature and National Identity in Late-Georgian England* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017). 28, 138

[58] Philip Hicks, 'The Roman Matron in Britain: Female Political Influence and Republican Response, ca. 1750–1800' *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 77, No. 1 (March 2005), 35-69, 36.

[59] General d'Arblay wrote that:

> J'apprens avec une extrême douleur, la détermination prise parle 1er Consul. Ma position est d'autant plus fâcheuse que je n'ai obtenu à Londre mon passeport que sous la condition expresse de ne pas rentrer, d'ici à un an au moins, en Angleterre où j'ai laissé ma femme malade avec mon fils. Recevez mon General mes remercie-mens bien sincères de l'intérêts que vous avez eu la bonté de me témoigner. Le coup de foudre qui vient de me frapper bien à l'improviste, ne peut rien changer à mes sentimens, et jamais je n'oublierai ce que je dois à mon Pays et à celui qui après l'avoir tiré des horreurs de l'anarchie, a mis fin à mon bannissement.
>
> I learn with extreme sadness the determination taken by the first consul. But my position is yet more irritating, as I was only able to obtain a passport in London unde the express condition that i would not be able to return for a year at least, in England where I left my sick wife with my son. You deserve, my general, my thanks most sincere for the concern which you have had the goodness to prove. The bolt from the blue which has just unexpectedly struck me, cannot change my feelings, and I will never forget what my duty to my country which, after having endured the horrors of the anarchy, has put an end to my banishment.

Alexander d'Arblay to Alexandre Berthier, Feb 1802, in Joyce Hemlow, ed. The *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay),* Vol. 5: West Humble and Paris 1801 – 3, (Oxford: OUP, 1975, 2014), End Matter, Item 16.

tore me to pieces.'[60] But most interesting is the spectre of 'certain amphibious females' at the Port of Calais:

> The calm which caused our slow passage, & our sickness, was now favourable, for it took us into the Port of Calais so close & even with the quay, that we scarcely accepted even an hand, to aid us from the vessel to the land. Many, however, were the hands that were offered us; the quay was lined with crowds of people, men, women, Children, & certain amphibious females, who might have passed for either sex, or any thing else in the world, except what they really were, European Women!—Their Man's Hats, man's Jackets, & man's shoes, their burnt skins | & most savage looking peticoats [sic], hardly reaching—nay, not reaching their knees, would have made me instantly believe any account I could have heard of their being just imported from the wilds of America. The vessel also was presently filled with men, who, though dirty & mean, were so civil & gentle that they could not displease, & who entered it so softly & quietly, that, neither hearing nor seeing them approach, it seemed as if they had availed themselves of some secret trap doors through which they had mounted, to fill the ship, without sound or bustle, in a single moment. [61]

As we saw in Chapter Three, Renaud Morieux has argued that the fuzziness of national borders complicated discrete conceptions of national identity, especially in the wake of the French Revolution.[62] Militarisation further disrupts the picture.[63] This seems to be the case here, with the discrete nationalities on the boat faced by the almost overwhelming other. But there is also a distinct Colonial Other lurking, one that bears the hallmarks of the both the unthreading of nationality engendered by the American and French Revolutions. Here, the discrete persons on the boat dissolve into a mass of 'crowds' and 'hands', 'who might have passed for either sex', 'except what they really were, European Women.' The terror here is distinctly new. So too is the language of 'really were', which points to a post ancien-regime identity of intrinsic gender in direct opposition to the material identity of Evelina's shopping trip. Yet this is not unassailable. Such terror finds its roots in the colonial wars, where the lost colonies and post-revolutionary state of France have descended from civilisation to a primordial state 'wilds of America.' Just as the experience of the mob in *Camilla* threatened a breakdown of social order and return to the driving force of violence, here Burney expresses her fear that life in a revolutionary, post-monarchical state will dislodge her own hard-won

[60] She brought along with her not just their son Alexander, but a charge of Mrs Locke. Adrienne de Chavagnac. See Hemlow, *The History,* 312-3.
[61] Frances Burney d'Arblay to Charles Burney, D.Mus. Journal for 15–19 April 1802, in Joyce Hemlow, ed. *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay),* Vol. 5: West Humble and Paris 1801 – 3, (Oxford: OUP, 1975, 2014), Letter 508.
[62] Renaud Morieux, *The Channel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 328 – 9.
[63] Morieux, *The Channel,* 139.

identities. Yet she finds hope. If the men 'so civil and gentle' – if not polite! – 'though dirty & mean' still formed part of a mob to storm the ship, then their behaviour at least promises the possibility of 'civil[ity]', against which she can preserve her identity. Hanoverian identity, now that it permits a degree of Catholic sympathy, is enough – especially when compared to the violence of revolution.

More comfort of a sort comes from the process of crossing the border. From the docks, Burney was taken to the 'municipality', where she was ordered to present her passport to the Commissary. She replies that it is in her Ecritoire, which had been carried along with her unbidden by the crowd which had met the ship.

> It was still very formidable to me, from a thousand starting recollections, to mount a sort of Tower, where were seated two civil officers, who examined our Passports. They wrote in them—I never examined what—& I was desired to go into a round Closet on one side the room. I took my two Children, for my protectors, & a formal, but civil old Gentleman asked me if I brought any thing contrary to the Laws of the republic? Another adding it was the room where an oath was taken to that effect. I did not chuse to give a very categorical answer to this demand, all my new peticoats jumping in the Mouth of my Conscience, which answered, inwardly, it would rather I should lose them all than give a plump negative: I merely therefore replied, That I brought nothing for sale. This, to my equal surprise & pleasure, satisfied them; they took hold of my Ecritoire; I told them it only contained Letters,— & they returned it unexamined.. […] In the Hall, to which we now passed our Passports were taken, & deposited—& we had new ones drawn up and given us in their stead.[64]

The echo of Ellis crossing the border into England here is yet another sign of Burney's unsettling political project. Yet if Ellis and the English passengers of the boat escaped in the dead of night from a desolate shore, in fear of being detected by the authorities, and arrive into an English bureaucracy that is reassuringly stable, then this is quite the reverse. Indeed, the shift from the formless urgency of the crowd at the dock to the demands of the customs officials here points to a Napoleonic stability of law, order, and thus identity. In other words, the 'two civil officers' and the 'formal, but civil old gentleman' embody the 'laws of the republic' and thus provide a reassuring counterpart to the mob outside. There is, moreover, a literature of identity. A palpable relief not just that she is able to pass the oral examination, but that her passport can be stamped and exchanged for a French document. Yet this surely remains radically isolating, both pointing to the unmoored and contingent nature of her

[64] Frances Burney d'Arblay to Charles Burney, D.Mus. Journal for 15–19 April 1802.

identity in Napoleonic France. Like Sir John Belmont's easy destruction of his certificate of marriage in *Evelina*, it shrouds the dependency of identity and citizenship on patriarchal whims in a legalistic framework, and in so doing, returns to the contingency of nationality.

Little wonder then her experience of Calais reminded her of the mutability of her own nationality. Having been given new passports, the passengers went to the 'Meurrice' hotel, where their goods were entered and dropped for inspection at the customs house. That done, Burney felt encouraged enough to take her son and her charge for a walk, beginning a passage which again bears the hallmarks of *Camilla*. They found themselves: 'in the Market place, which was completely[sic] full of Sellers & Buyers, & Booths, looking like a large English Fair.' The children were predictably amused, and Frances was predictably frightened, though as the 'shadow of danger' began to retreat, the she 'grew much amused from the sight.' She was particularly fascinated by the 'queer gawdy jackets' of the women, '& their immense wing caps', but also by the 'gold necklaces, Chains, & crosses' seemingly worn by every social class. Yet Burney was equally shocked by the lack of beggars, as 'I had conceived an horrific idea of the populace of this country, imagining them all transformed into bloody monsters' as she was by the 'extremely fair' majority, as she had been 'taught to expect nothing but mahoghany [sic] com-plexions and hideous features instantly on crossing the Strait of Dover.'[65] Like her court diaries, we cannot take this as factual observations of her experiences or prejudices. The stringent attempts to classify new arrivals, to separate the residents from the aliens, is a hangover of the new model of revolutionary citizenship that stripped General d'Arblay of his property and placed him on the list of exiles. But her account of the crowds of Calais and the legal bureaucracy which demarcates residents and aliens finds its counterpart in the British textual milieu which can create Britons and traitors at ease.

Yet the racial heterogeneity here is a critical, at first glance, surprising complication. Burney notes her surprise at the 'extremely fair' complexion of many of the women and children, because she 'had been taught to expect nothing but mahoghany com-plexions & hideous features' the moment she stepped on to French soil. She feigns expectation that revolutionary politics will be reflected in physiognomy. Yet with an eye to the Scottish predicament after

[65] Ibid. This must surely be read with a degree of irony; her father and friends had all spent large amounts of time on the continent.

the Highland Clearances, the Highlander remarks how 'calais was in the hands of the English so many years, that the English race there is not yet extinct!' Now assured that she does not walk among the racial other, Burney feels able to walk around without fear of racial or social contagion, certain that their ancestral links to the English race and the fuzziness of national boundaries cannot but anchor them. Yet Burney is perfectly aware that such historical influence necessarily complicates – and indeed even proves ridiculous – discrete national identities. In fact, she goes out of the way to remind her reader not only of the history of Franco-English conflicts, but of how racial difference 'I had been taught to expect nothing but mahoghany [sic] complexions and hideous features' is a cultural construct, imprinted as much by bureaucracy as by education, on unwilling populations.

Burney's identity in France became ever more professionalised. At first, Burney was relatively content in Paris; many of d'Arblay's friends were among the '*ci devants'*, those who – like him – had lost property, status, and relatives during the terror. [66] Burney was captivated by their manners, 'so pleasant, & so kind, that I should have no sort of fault to find with them if I could only double my life' and thereby have both solitude and society.[67] Yet her 'days are not on the increase, but on the wane.'[68] *Evelina* and *Cecilia* in particular had earned Burney a sparkling reputation.[69] It was a source of constant amazement to her that Mrs Crewe's description of the reception awaiting her was 'so verified, that not a day passes without my receiving some testimony, of politeness, hospitality, or kindness, as little

[66] Hemlow, *The History*, 314.
[67] Frances Burney d'Arblay to Charlotte Broome, 25 June–17 July 1802, in Joyce Hemlow, ed. *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay),* Vol. 5: West Humble and Paris 1801 – 3, (Oxford: OUP, 1975, 2014), Letter 524.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Catherine M. Rodriguez points out that de Laclos's assessment of *Cecilia's* importance mirrored its fame in the country.

> The Journal Encyclopedique followed with an anonymous review in July of the same year. Moreover, as in America, Cecilia had some noteworthy French owners, if not readers, including Marie Antoinette and Jacques Necker, the King's finance minister. An entry in the Catalogue Collectif de France (CCFR) lists a 1783 copy held by the Bibliotheque Nationale, with the note "aux armes de Marie-Antoinette." And Germaine de Stael, Necker's daughter, in forms Burney that reading Cecilia brought her father out of the depression into which he had fallen after the King's execution. Later, when Burney lived in France she was often lauded and greeted as the author of Evelina and Cecilia

Catherine M. Rodriguez, 'The History of a Novel's Travels Abroad: Foreign Editions of Frances Burney's "Cecilia"' *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America,* Vol. 99, No. 4 (December 2005), 539-571, 556.

See also Hemlow, *The History*, 315.

expected as deserved, from all the circle to which I have been presented.'[70] Part of the difficulty here is in Burney's difficulty with the French language. As she recounts to Mrs Locke in an account drafted early in her time at Paris,

> I am so little able to say what I mean as I mean in French, that I am perpetually entangled in difficulties when I attempt a phrase of more than 5 or 6 words: & the moment any embarrassment begins, my very ideas become obscure from the horrible provocation of searching in vain for words that may explain them.[71]

Her disinclination to speak French must be seen in the context of an enduring wider literary reputation.[72] Burney's fame cannot be underestimated, stretching as it did through the rupture of the *ancien regime* and into the new Napoleonic period. June Burton points to an episode where Madame Campan invited Burney to a *pensionnat*, considering her fame an excellent advertisement for her new school.[73] It was strong enough for Napoleon to temper his anger at M. d'Arblay's refusal to serve; he would lose no rights, remaining as he was the husband of the author of Cecilia.[74] He was even granted a meagre pension, and went on to secure employment in the ministry of the interior.[75] Meanwhile, d'Arblay's own claims to French citizenship had remained; with no prospect of recovering ancestral property seized during the revolution, they had invested in a house two miles from the centre of Paris 'in order to substantiate his citizenship,' a process which would take several years of continued occupation.[76] Burney's time in France then must be seen as a paradoxical period of radical isolation and at times overwhelming fame, caught as she was between the need to immerse herself in French society in order to help Alexandre reclaim his citizenship without losing her own Englishness. She was at the same time at the centre of a vibrant social circle who were

---

[70] Frances Burney to Charles Burney, Mus.D, 10 June 1802, in Joyce Hemlow, ed. *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay),* Vol. 5: West Humble and Paris 1801 – 3, (Oxford: OUP, 1975, 2014), Letter 521.

[71] Frances Burney d'Arblay to Frederica Locke, 'Female Worthies Part I' April – May 1802, in Joyce Hemlow, ed. *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay),* Vol. 5: West Humble and Paris 1801 – 3, (Oxford: OUP, 1975, 2014), Letter 515.

[72] Harman notes that since:

> neither of them were truly bilingual, […] English was the language they spoke at home – at least, it was when they were in France. Fanny [sic] could understand and read French very well by now, but was frustrated at her lack of fluency in speech. […] She found the effort of speaking French tiring and boring.

Harman, *Fanny Burney,* 299.

[73] June J. Burton, *Napoleon and the Woman Question: Discourses of the Other Sex in French Education, Medicine, and Medical Law* (Lubbock. TX: Texas Tech University Press, 2007), 33 – 7.

[74] Pencil note following Alexandre d'Arblay to Lafayette 3rd March 1802 Berg 1/202, NYPL.

[75] Hemlow, *The History,* 317.

[76] Harman, *Fanny Burney,* 299-300.

overjoyed to manage the social capital of the author of Cecilia. Yet while she attempted to preserve her identity against erosion or corruption, she only succeeded in alienating herself from both Britain and France.

This would only intensify as hostilities resumed and cross-channel communication ceased. Hemlow notes that 'Frances had hoped to return to England in October, 1803, but on May 18th the Peace of Amiens came to an end.'[77] With the end of the peace, 'emigration regulations, a coastal blockade, and war on the seas made travel difficult or impossible.' She was, Hemlow suggests, 'an exile.' Nevertheless, Hemlow's assertion that this was by no means wholly unpleasant must be examined. As Harman notes, her isolation – both from England and France – should not be underestimated. Napoleon's declaration on 22 May 'that all English Englishmen and Woman in France between the ages of eighteen and sixty were to be considered prisoners of war' were accompanied by a near-cessation of cross-channel mail; even though a handful of letters were able to make their way to England, both Dr Burney and Frances feared family news would be misinterpreted as espionage.[78] This fear was not unfounded. Before the resumption of hostilities, Burney was writing letters to the court. While these were ostensibly addressed to Miss Planta, they were clearly meant to be read aloud before her former royal mistress.[79] Moreover, although the resumption of financial stress led to the natural question of whether she would again take up her pen, Burney admitted that she had almost entirely lost the will to write since arriving in France.[80] Her correspondence waned; Dr Burney's age had caught up with him. This was much more than a financial problem. If, as Epstein argued, Burney 'wrote in order to permit herself to live' through – this thesis adds – to contest and refract the competing demands on the stability of her identities, then this stasis becomes inextricably bound up with her exile.[81] It is no wonder, then, that Burney jokingly described her public identity in France as 'a gothic anglaise.'[82] In other words, a literary archetype, out of step with the march of history. Her existence in France saw, as she feared on the Calais docks, a shift away from both stable French and English identities and towards a purely literary half-life, one where she finds herself – like

[77] Hemlow, *The History,* 317.
[78] Harman, *Fanny Burney,* 300-1.
[79] Burton, *Napoleon and the Woman Question,* 37. Campan considered Frances' Royal connections an excellent addition to her literary worth.
[80] Harman, *Fanny Burney,* 299.
[81] Epstein, *The Iron Pen,* 9.
[82] Chisholm, *Fanny Burney,* 204. Burney uses the term to describe the spectacle made by her public appearance in dresses brought with her from England, rather than exposing her arms and bosom as fashion expected.

Cecilia – unable to express herself and at the mercy of religious and political forces against which she struggles in vain.

Bonaparte therefore promised a Hanoverianesque stability from the ruins of revolution. Her first positive comment came upon her arrival in Calais, where she 'heard people talking about the restoration du Dimanche. "The bon Dieu had been lost for ten years – but Bonaparte had now found him." The genius of the first consul was already felt everywhere.'[83] This admiration continued at least as late as 1812, when she visited the studio of Jacques-Louis David and saw *L'Empereur debout dans son cabinet,* commissioned by Alexander Hamilton-Douglas for the almost unheard of sum of £1,000. 'Every circumstance was executed from the Emperor's own orders,' and Burney goes on to describe how the picture was to be a piece of political propaganda directed 'to the British Nation, through the British Nobleman' for whom it was designed.[84] Burney's first glimpse of the Consul in May 1802 had been marked by the same impression. Viewing the consul on parade, she saw that 'In every feature, Care, Thought, Melancholy, & Meditation are strongly marked, with so much of character, nay, Genius, & so penetrating a seriousness—or rather sadness[.]'[85] Seeing him ignore 'the prancing, rearing, or other freaks of his horse', she claims to be 'the last to be a Judge upon this subject, but as a Remarker' he appeared to her 'a man who knew so well he could manage his animal when he pleased.' [86] Of course, he claims to be a mere 'remarker' are rather disingenuous. What these two accounts suggest is, if not quite the identification of a kindred spirit, but something more than blank interest and sympathy. Burney sees a man who

---

[83] Hemlow, *The History,* 313;

[84]

> This, I suppose, as a display not merely personal, he left to the Artist; as well as the peeping out, on a Corner of the Table, of an Imperial Diadem: but, what belonged to himself individually was by himself indicated: his face, therefore, has an expression as simple, as unaffected, & as unassuming as his attire, &, with the fall of his hands, which are very finely finished, he seems to mean making an appeal to the British Nation, through the British Nobleman for whom this Representation of their renowned Antagonist is designed, that shall cry out: Look at me, Britons! survey me well! What have you to fear, or doubt? What is there to excite such deadly hatred, in a Man as soberly & modestly arrayed as the plainest John Bull among yourselves, & as philosophically employed, without state or attendance?—The burthen of this appeal was *'Why should You not make Peace with me*? For, though the last desire of his turbulent ambition was to Keep Peace, the First was to Make it, as stamping for Posterity the recognition of his Imperial title by the British Legislature.

David's studio, Spring 1812. in Joyce Hemlow (ed.), *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay), Vol. 6: France 1803–1812:* Letters 550–631, 598.

[85] Frances Burney d'Arblay to Charles Burney DMus, *Paris Journal,* 5,6 May 1802, in Joyce Hemlow, ed. *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay),* Vol. 5: West Humble and Paris 1801 – 3, (Oxford: OUP, 1975, 2014), Letter 518.

[86] Ibid.

can instil order and religion on Jacobin anarchy. A man whose light touch is at once terrifying and reassuring in its reminder of total control. But more importantly, even after ten years, Burney still sees a man whose 'genius' was peace and order. A genius, too, not just of self-fashioning, but national self-fashioning, ex nihilo. Only he can embody order, religion, and sovereignty. Only he understands the relationship between performance and national embodiment. Burney of course read the David portrait as propaganda. But these letters clearly if tacitly compare Napoleonic France with post-1688 England and its crisis of legitimacy, as George III struggled with illness and the threat of a Regency. If Burney does not exactly welcome invasion, then she understands the Napoleonic event as just one more historical repetition, and of the benefits of this totalitarianism against anarchy.

Yet if separation from the British polite spaces had unstuck Frances' identity, her son had become wholly French. Alexander had spent his formative years in France, first hot-housed by his father, and then in a succession of schools, accumulating prizes as he went – often at the expense of popularity with his fellow students.[87] By early 1812, Alex had spent two thirds of his life in France. As the age of conscription approached, his parents were keen he should escape to England. Their plan, as Harman recounts, was that Burney would secure Alexander a university place, then after visiting family for a few months, return to spend the rest of the war with her husband.[88] The trip itself was fraught.[89] Frances had already failed to cross the channel thanks to a 'universal embargo' two years earlier, and her chance of getting to England relied on taking passage on a ship bound ostensibly to America, but calling illegally at Dover.[90] Unfortunately for the passengers, 'the United States had declared war on Britain in June [and] the boat was duly seized by the British.'[91] Not that Frances, dreadfully sick in her cabin, had noticed. When she finally made it on deck, she was greeted by Lieutenant Harford, who 'hearing my name, most courteously addressed me with congratulations upon my safe arrival in England.'[92] Yet when she called Alexander to follow her onto the British ship, Lieutenant Harford told her

[87] Hemlow, *The History*, 318.
[88] Harman, *Fanny Burney, 309.*
[89] While waiting for her ship at Dunkirk, her attempts to offer money to destitute Spanish prisoners of war led to her near imprisonment on charges of espionage, a fate escaped only after a close interrogation by the local police office. Doody, *Frances Burney,* 316.
[90] Ibid.
[91] Harman, *Fanny Burney*, 310.
[92] Frances Burney 'a journal entitled: DUNKIRK / and / DEAL. / 1812.' in Joyce Hemlow (ed.), *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay),* Vol. 6: France 1803–1812: Letters 550–631, 631.

> No French person can come into my Boat without a passport & permission from Government. 'My air, now a little corresponded with his own, as I answered 'He was Born, Sir, in England! "O!' cried he; 'that's quite another matter! Come along, Sir! we'll all go to-gether.'
> […]
> I now found we were rowing to Deal, not Dover, to which town we had been destined by our engagement: but we had been captured, it seems, *chemin faisant*, though so gently, & with such utter helplessness of opposition, that I had become a Prisoner without any suspicion of my captivity, from the disordering sufferings which left one no faculties but for themselves. We had anchored about half a mile, I imagine, from the shore; which I no sooner touched, than, drawing away my arm from Mr. , I took up, on one knee, with irrepressible transport, the nearest bright pebble, to press to my lips, in grateful joy at touching again the land of my Nativity[.][93]

The similarities to the opening passage of *The Wanderer* do not end there. Frances' suspicion that she and her son were prisoners was only assuaged when she was able to call on existing networks of local gentry in order to verify her identity.[94] She notes how 'Mr. Harford was well pleased; & the more when, upon hearing that Admiral Foley was the Port Commander at Deal' and Burney was able to mention her connection 'to Lady Lucy, his wife' whom she had known at Norbury, and sent her a note to meet that afternoon. This was more than a social visit; in bringing Burney into her home for 'the greatest part of 5 days', she was not just awaiting her family – who had assumed she would be landing at Dover - but re-establishing her English identity and anchoring her son in English society.

Yet while Burney was quickly re-established, the question of her son's religious and national identity remained problematic. Frances' first task was to catch up on ten years of family history. Her first meeting with her father was shocking – she had been unaware that he had suffered a paralytic stroke some years earlier. Her account, mostly preserved in a long letter to Alexandre, is an insightful look into the difficulties 'of the next generation of Burneys, none of whom was born into money or rank.'[95] Thankfully, one of the most uncertain prospects of her generation had succeeded. Not only had Gonville and Caius College rescinded the judgement against Charles for theft in 1807, but through royal decree had conferred him the degree of M.A one year later, followed in 1812 by a Doctorate in

[93] Ibid.
[94] Chisolm notes that when her brother, Charles, ran into them at a coach station, he nearly walked past them unaware. Not only had Frances put on weight and Alexander grown to over six foot tall, but Frances now spoke with an accent that was neither English nor French. Chisholm, *Fanny Burney*, 222
[95] Chisholm, *Fanny Burney*, 223

Divinity.[96] Safely ordained, with two livings and a well-established school in Greenwich, he was in perfect position to help Alexander. [97] Help he did. Much to his Frances's irritation, who thought it a subject hardly likely to attract a salary large enough to entice a wife, Alexander resolved to study Mathematics. Charles duly arranged for Alex's arrival at the school – now run by his son – and planned for him to go up to Cambridge the following autumn.[98] For this, however, they would need money. While she hastened to complete *The Wanderer*, she mustered her friends and family to write letters of recommendation for a vacant scholarship worth £120 a year.[99] This, as Hemlow points out, points to the importance of networks of patronage. Yet this goes beyond 'winning' scholarships. The Tancred was only tenable to British candidates. Frances thus had to provide 'certified proof by asking the accoucheur who had delivered Alex to sign an affidavit saying that he had personally observed the birth.'[100] Frances also wrote directly to Queen Charlotte, reporting that the other candidates for the scholarship had 'asserted, to Mr. Lyons, the Lawyer of the Institution, that my English Boy was born in *Calais'* and though Charles has his baptismal certificate, 'they must have the certificate of his Birth in Gt Bookham from someone present.'[101] Burney paves the way for a last appeal to royalty in order to assert the British identity of her son. More importantly, however, this legitimates the role of social authority over legalistic identity

[96] Hemlow, *The History*, 330.

[97] Hester Thrale, writing in 1811, suggests that Frances wrote Evelina for Charles' 'relief when he was not a Bishop expectant.' Charles went up to Gonville and Caius in January 1777, and was sent down in October 1778, having stolen books from the University Library to pay his gambling debts. Despite Hester's implication that Evelina was written to pay these debts, it is frankly unlikely – there is no evidence Frances knew about his debts, and she kept the money from *Evelina*'s publication.
Hester Lynch Piozzi to Lady Keith, 25th March 1811, MS Hyde 5, Houghton Library, Harvard,

[98] Chisholm, *Fanny Burney*, 226. Chisholm also points out that, despite Alexander's excellence at France, the rather anachronistic syllabus of French mathematical education – they did not, for example, touch upon Isaac Newton's discoveries – would mean that he would be at a disadvantage in England without a brief introduction to new mathematical approaches.

[99]

> Charles, with unfailing kindness, wrote to five of the seven members of the board of electors […]. The Governor of Chelsea College was assigned to Dr. Burney. Fanny herself wrote to one of her most faithful friends, Lady Keith […] asking her or her husband [Lord Keith, by 1812 Commander in Chief in the English Channel, and decorated hero of the Napoleonic Wars] to write to Lord Hood (the governor of Greenwich Hospital) [and under whom Lord Keith had served at the beginning of the French Revolutionary Wars] and finally she wrote to the Queen: 'Ah, Madame! – if I dared solicit your majesty's permission to supplicate the intercession of their Royal Highnesses with the Duke of York!' A word from him would obtain Sir David Dundas, the Treasurer of Lincoln's Inn. […] This time the application was unanimously successful

Ibid.

[100] Chisholm, *Frances Burney*, 227.

[101] Frances Burney to Queen Charlotte, 6 March 1813, in Edward A. Bloom and Lillian A. Bloom (eds), *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay)*, Vol. 7: 1812–1814.

asserted in *Evelina*. Alexander's identity is unmoored. [102] His mother's efforts to affix him in English society through her own systems of family and patronage are not just attempts to seek an advantageous place. Rather, as revealed in the whispers of his competitors for the scholarship, they point to the fragility of his place in English society, and the anxieties of his mother lest the exile of his formative years forever dislodge him from both England and France thereby assigning him the nebulous Catholicism which had so unsettled Madame Duval.

Ellis' struggle to fend for herself in English society thus represents Burney's anxieties for her son outside her networks of patronage which anchor his claims to Britishness.[103] Ellis arrives in England penniless, and as Epstein points out 'the loss of her money immediately makes her dependent on the goodwill of others […] as in *Cecilia,* Burney's subject is the economics of eighteenth-century womanhood.'[104] Ellis is thus forced to work. Ellis' working life involves a steady slide down the social scale, with 'the section dealing with [her] career as a music teacher' finding inspiration from her father, sister Hester, and brother in law Charles Rousseau Burney in the scenes of 'well to do ladies [who] refuse to pay their accounts.'[105] Giles Arbe's angry and futile attempts to get the fashionable ladies to pay their music bills allows Burney to articulate a passionate defence of the 'creative and interpretative artists' and the toll of their labour on their bodies.[106] This did not just refer back to her father and brother in law, of course, but their wide circle of friends and acquaintances. Yet as Epstein points out, while Ellis 'exploits all the talents and crafts she has been taught by an aristocratic education', 'they were not meant to be thus put to employment for pay […] only for the privilege of charming […] a future husband.'[107] In other words, these talents were meant to

[102] In a letter to her brother James in 1815, Burney suggests that his bi-nationalism makes him fundamentally other in both England and France. This, however, is not necessarily to his disadvantage:

> Were he more like other people, I, also, might more resemble my neighbours: but he seemed au exotic in France from having been born in England: he seems so also in England from having been bred in France – yet the amalgamation, could he steady his pursuits, might cause him to figure to advantage, & approbation, in either country.

Frances Burney d'Arblay to James Burney, 30 November 1815, Egerton MS 3699 B Barrett Collection Vol XI, British Library.
[103] Indeed, Burney refers to her son as 'the poor wanderer' in a letter of 1817. Warren Derry, ed. *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame D'Arblay), 10 vols., Vol. 9: Bath 1815–1817,* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 305
[104] Epstein, *The Iron Pen,* 183.
[105] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 351.
[106] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 353.
[107] Epstein, *The Iron Pen,* 183.

be part of the visual culture of identity. To return to slightly anachronistic Girardian analysis, women were taught these skills to increase their value on the marriage market in order to be exchanged between men, not to self-emancipate through economic agency.

The Wanderer thus marks Burney's most explicit rejection of the possibility of sociable commerce to replace the great chain of being. With her attempts to teach music having failed, Juliet 'is forced to take another step downwards from both gentility and independence by seeking employment in Mrs Matson's milliner's shop.'[108] Like the scramble for Juliet's stories aboard the boat, Mrs Matson soon discovers the economic benefits of such an unusual worker, while Juliet is horrified to discover that not only are the 'genteel customers [...] thoughtless, rude, and vain', but Mrs Matson's business thrives on overcharging the poor to make up for the losses incurred from the poor credit of the rich. Juliet, however, is unable to speak out against this injustice. The first thing to go is her 'independent morality [and] responsibility.' Worst of all, the 'pretty girls sit where they are visible through the window,' in order to attract 'starers,' and 'the beautiful foreigner with her mysterious history' is the star attraction.[109] The interruption of social vision is consistently associated with the toils of labour. Shortly after the failure of her attempts to teach music, Ellis had lodged with Gabrielle, a fellow émigré, and together received 'orders for embroidery.' Yet even reducing their meals and sleep to the essentials, they find themselves too busy to even 'look at one another while talking.'[110] Labour is thus incompatible with the surveillance that supposedly maintains polite Anglican womanhood. Women are always seen, not seeing; it is the male gaze that is the sole determinant of value.

Just as in *Cecilia* and *Camilla*, Burney thus rejects the possibility proposed by Smith that sociable commerce can replace the great chain of being. Indeed, it is tacitly compared to the economic injustices of pre-Revolutionary France. Just as Captain Mirvan is able to write and subvert the law and impose nationality at will, so too are the aristocrats able to discharge debt and contracts for as long as they are able to maintain their own social credit. In other words, as Juliet finds, her clients can avoid paying if they are seen to be able to pay. Credit, rather than being a self-correcting product of the market, is proved dependent once more on patriarchal violence, and the oppression of the poor. This memory of pre-Revolutionary

[108] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 354.
[109] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 354.
[110] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 352.

France sparks an existential terror. While Ellis remains pseudonymous, plummeting down the social scale while her 'true' roots are unknown, welcoming her either by placing her amongst the gentry or labouring class risks inviting a revolutionary dissolution of their own precarious identities relying as they do on a clear separation from the material and violent realities of supposedly natural distinctions. Ellis' presence points not just to the fluidity of identity, then, but in her earlier racial ambiguity the fundamental malleability of western bodies. It is only when she is safely behind glass that she can be fully encountered, separated from the inclusive gaze of the gentry by the window. Once Mrs Matson can control not only who she is able to see, but who is able to see her, Juliet's skills – and body - are safely transformed back into economic value. Just as Eugenia is unable to be both commodity and agent, so too is Juliet unable to be both producer and merchant.

Seeing men such as Sir Lyell prey upon her colleagues, Ellis/Juliet seeks employment with a mantua maker. Yet this proves to be even worse drudgery. Though she has 'liberty' every evening, she becomes 'a stranger to security, subject to dismission, at the mercy of accident, and at the will of caprice.'[111] Employment with Mrs Ireton, by contrast, appears to offer both a modicum of leisure and a stable social identity. Yet Juliet finds herself under endless psychological torment. Giles Arbe, however, speaks up for Juliet's rights. Mrs Ireton in turn appeals to duty and hierarchy, asking whether

> 'We must do nothing, then, but what we like? Even when we are in other people's houses? Even when we exist only through the goodness of some of our superiours? […]
> 'Good la, Ma'am,' interrupted Mr Giles: 'Why that would be leading the life of a slave! And that, I suppose, is what they meant, all this time, by a toad-eater. However, don't look so ashamed, my pretty dear, for a toad-eater-maker is still worse! Fie, fie! What can rich people be thinking of, to lay out their money in buying their fellow-creatures' liberty of speech and thought! and then paying them for a bargain which they ought to despise them for selling?' [112]

Juliet, Mrs Ireton argues, is a guest 'in other people's houses', who exists 'only through the goodness of some of our superiors,' and thus must surrender her 'liberty' and 'opinion.' To be under such constant surveillance is, as Burney's previous novels detail, the position both of the outsider and the insider. Juliet's subservience here therefore shows Burney once more

[111] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 455.
[112] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 524-5

revealing the fragility of liberty and identity, whether French or British. Ireton's sarcastic politeness 'I am quite happy' 'obliged,' 'the goodness to direct my servants' only reveals her own uncertainty faced with an apparent personification of individual rights that dissolve not just social, but racial distinctions. As Juliet had seen at their first meeting, Ireton had responded to her black page's subversive laughter by threatening 'I will have you shipped back to the West Indies.'[113] Yet, like the emigres at Juniper Hall, there is no country to which Juliet could be 'shipped back.' Unable to 'live the life of a slave' then, she must somehow be accommodated to England's racial and class strictures without puncturing their claims to universality or revealing how women act as carriers for value for men. Mrs Ireton's increasingly frantic demands thus appear as a matter of instilling a subservient class identity in Juliet to strengthen her own racial superiority, lest she be faced with mutability of her own womanhood. Peter Mandler suggests 'identity is an elusive quality, and national identity even more so.'[114] Contra Colley, Mandler highlights the contextual, contested nature of identity, where 'national identity' is not a case of an identity against the Other, and that attempts to divine salience and origin of identities is near impossible.[115] Juliet thus illuminates both Mandler's point that national identity, like any identity, is always contextual and contested. But in the constant need for performative submission, and Juliet's accompanying psychological torment, Burney points once more to the gap between public demands and private identities, and their reliance on what LeCain would term a neo-materialistic web of productive relations that nurture and are nurtured by consumption.[116] Unable to correctly perform Anglican Womanhood, the only alternative is pure tekné – to broadcast one's automation and subjugation under the hands of her betters.

Any sign of interiority from Juliet can only be parsed as subversive. Riled by the stern lecture from Arbe, 'Mrs Ireton, now, dying to give some vent to her spleen, darted the full venom of her angry eyes upon Juliet.'[117] With a sarcastic reference to theories of luxury, she asks her to brush crumbs left by the dog on the chair, unless she wishes to create work for the 'mercer' or 'linen-draper' and dirty the dresses of her betters. Juliet, however, turns to leave.[118]

---

[113] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 482.
[114] Peter Mandler, 'What is "National Identity"? Definitions and Applications in Modern British Historiography' *Modern Intellectual History*, 3, 2 (2006), 271–297, 281.
[115]Mandler, 'What is…', 287, 275.
[116] Timothy LeCain, *The Matter of History: How Things Create the Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 192.
[117] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 525.
[118] Ibid.

> Astonished and offended, 'Permit me, Madam,' cried Mrs Ireton; 'permit me, Miss Ellis,—if it is not taking too great a liberty with a person of your vast consequence,—permit me to enquire who told you to go?'
> Juliet turned back her head, and quietly answered, 'A person, Madam, who has not the honour to be known to you,—myself!' And then steadily left the room.[119]

Juliet therefore rejects the social epistemology of British national identity in a scene that only further demonstrates Burney's familiarity with wider currents of political theory. 'A person' is reduceable to 'myself.' Yet while the self is in the process of being constructed out of the ruins of the French Revolution, it is resolutely anti-enlightenment. In contrast to the certainties of the new regime of Britishness, Juliet denies the ability of the social surveillance to pierce cultural trappings. In so doing, she acknowledges and rejects both the *ancien regime* malleability and its new crystallisations. Yet Juliet's refusal to locate herself within Ireton's narrow bounds 'a person […] who has not the honour to be known to you, - myself!' narrates a troubling rejection of the epistemological safety such subservience offered. Alexander d'Arblay faces the same problem. In rushing to assert Alex's English identity from birth, Burney seeks to minimise the risk that his French patrilineal identity might complicate the gentry identity his maternal identity and education merit.

Again, Ellis's inscrutability prompts an epistemological crisis among the polite women. For Mrs Ireton and Mrs Maple, Ellis/Juliet's rejection is indistinguishable from treason. Ellis's words 'caused a general surprize, and an almost universal demand of who the young person might be, and what she could mean.'[120] Indeed, '[t]he few words that had dropt from her had as many commentators as hearers.'[121] Mrs Ireton is on the verge of expelling her immediately. She is stopped, however, by a general cry of 'How very extraordinary that Mrs Ireton has never been able to discover who she is!' Instead, when Ellis tells Mrs Ireton that day that she is 'ready to depart' she is informed that she will be required the following day to supervise Ireton's young nephew for a trip to Arundel Castle. While there, Lord Melbury – long sympathetic and later revealed to be her half-brother - offers her his protection. Mrs Howel overhears and assumes the worst. Melbury is a mere boy, she exclaims. She 'cannot leave him to the machinations of an adventurer' and demands Juliet either return with Mrs Ireton, else 'the still unexplained mystery with which you have made your way into the

[119] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 525-6.
[120] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 526.
[121] Ibid.

kingdom, will authorise an application which you will vainly try to elude.'[122] This legalistic threat here is repeated moments later, when Juliet attempts to claim Melbury's protection.

> Convinced, therefore, of your deep laid scheme, to captivate to his disgrace a youth of an illustrious house, by revealing to him a pretended tale, which you craftily refuse to trust to all who may better judge, or try, its truth; I shall take, without delay, such measures as it behoves should be taken, by a friend of his family, and of himself, to effectually open his eyes to your arts, and to his own danger. In one word, therefore, Will you, and this instant, return to Brighthelmstone under the superintendence of Mrs Ireton?'
> 'No, Madam!' Juliet, without hesitation, replied.
> 'Enough! I shall myself take in charge, then, that you do not quit the castle, till the arrival of a peace-officer; who may conduct you where you may make your confession with rather more propriety than to a young nobleman!'[123]

The threat of treason and the magistrate once used by Mirvan to lure Madame Duval to extra-judicial justice is now summoned to deny the inscrutable Juliet the power to manage her own identity. Indeed, this goes beyond the mere conclusion of an interesting topic for polite conversation. Juliet's repartee claims both elite superiority through superior exertion of wit in a manner that translates this cultural capital into a radical denial of such social production of value and identity. For Mrs Ireton and Mrs Howel, such a rejection is functionally treasonous: having refused to permit her identity to be curated by one who considers herself a social superior, such a declaration of interiority must – like the competing histories of the Delviles or Duvals - represent loyalty to a foreign power. This Catholic identity is invoked in the 'confession' she might make to one other 'than to a young nobleman.' In other words, a refusal to satisfy Mrs Ireton's curiosity and bolster her social credit, or subservience to her social hierarchy represents a challenge to the very nature of British national identity.

It is clearly important, then, that this rejection of Anglican Womanhood takes place in Arundel Castle, the ancestral seat of Charles Howard, 11th Duke of Norfolk, the family of whom were famous for their recusancy. Arundel's history reflects the family's contentious place in English constitutional history. The Howards, who had long 'been a secular mainstay of the Catholic faction, ever since Cromwell's rise to power, at last took a wrong step' under Henry VIII.[124] While the 3rd Duke survived, his son – injudiciously declaiming descent from

[122] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 564-5.
[123] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 570.
[124] G.R Elton, "The Reformation in England," in Elton, G. R. (ed.) *The New Cambridge Modern History*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 262–287, 278

Edward I at a time the King was concerned with his heir's legitimacy - did not; worse, the second son and 4th Duke would be executed, and his lands confiscated, by Elizabeth I who feared a rival claim to sovereignty through a marriage with Mary, Queen of Scots.[125] By the 18th century, though restored to the family, Arundel was 'largely derelict,' although the chapel 'was visited by gentry tourists.'[126] By the time of the Terror, however, the 11th Duke had begun an extensive series of Gothic renovations, which hoped would reflect and assert 'the ancient liberties of England.'[127] The Duke's politics and faith were complex. 'On Sunday, 4 June 1780, coincidentally amidst the violence and panic of the Gordon Riots' the Earl of Surrey 'embraced Anglicanism in order to follow a parliamentary career.'[128] The date was pointedly chosen to coincide with the King's 42nd birthday, and thus 'reinforce their conformity and allegiance.'[129] News of their recantation quickly spread through 'numerous northern newspapers.' Yet the Earl of Surrey – hoping to keep the matter of his conversion an open question for his opponent - was upset with the extent of the reports, 'forcing the issue of an apology denying the apostasy even though the reports were true.' [130] Gascoigne and Surrey 'went to some lengths to limit the effects of their conversion' on the Catholics gathered on their estates, while Surrey, succeeding to the Dukedom in 1786, 'kept open the Catholic chapels at Graystoke and Arundel Castles merely moving them from the main house to one of the outbuildings.'[131] Lock thus argues that both Gascoigne and Surrey understood legal 'abjuration' had little effect on their religious beliefs, evincing a 'liberal Catholic' separation of private and public roles with which to justify their apostacy while continuing to 'nurtur[e] Catholic communities on their estates.'[132] Charles Howard's political career was complex. As Lock noted, he began under the patronage of the Duke of Portland. Portland served as the head of the Fox-North Ministry from 1783, though he later broke with Fox and the faction over the French Revolution, and eventually, backed by the Pittites, he become First Lord of the Treasury in 1807.[133] Portland, moreover, was well known to the Burneys.

---

[125] C. Wright, *The History and Description of Arundel Castle* (London: 1818), 106.
[126] Clare Haynes, 'Of Her Making: The Cultural Practice of Mary, 9th Duchess of Norfolk', *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*, Vol. 31, No. 1/2, Eighteenth-Century Women And English Catholicism (Spring/Fall 2012), 77-98, 80, 83.
[127] Mark Bence-Jones, *The Catholic Families*, (London: Constable, 1992), 102-4.
[128] Alexander Lock, 'Catholicism, Apostasy and Politics in Late Eighteenth-Century England: The Case of Sir Thomas Gascoigne and Charles Howard, Earl of Surrey' *Recusant History*, Vol. 30:2 275–298, 276.
[129] Charles Howard recanted alongside Sir Thomas Gascoigne who, like him, sought political office in the north of England. Lock, 'Catholicism, Apostasy…', 277.
[130] Ibid.
[131] Lock, 'Catholicism, Apostasy…'285
[132] Lock, 'Catholicism, Apostasy…', 286, 293.
[133] Jeremy Black, *George III: America's Last King* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006), 252, 402.

First meeting the Earl in 1793 through a friend's brother's marriage, Charles was able to move past 'Portland's democratic leanings [which] somewhat disturbed him.' [134] During a visit to the Crewe family at Dover, Burney was delighted to again meet the Duke, along with Pitt, Dundas, and Canning – the others, however, having to endure his dreadful astronomical poem, were no doubt less keen on his company.[135] Frances Burney, then, would have been well acquainted with the history of the Castle. She would also have known that in 1798. Charles Howard proposed a toast to Charles James Fox's health, and 'Our sovereign's health: The Majesty of the People.'[136] This was, as Hague points out, not just a radically whiggish attachment to 1688, but a dangerously Jacobin sentiment given the political climate.[137] Arundel Castle, therefore, is a particularly contested space, emblematic of the contested nature of British history, and the poly-confessional landscape.

Juliet's visit to Arundel Castle is thus to a space which interrogates the possibility of private Catholicism and public conformity, and thus of the via media which Burney has long sought. Meditating on the day ahead, full of servile demands, Juliet tellingly looks forward to seeing: 'what remains of the venerable old castle; to visit its ancient chapel; to examine the genealogical records of the long gallery; to climb up to the antique citadel[.]'[138] Indeed, the chapel is a clear curiosity for the party. While most hurry towards 'the Roman Catholic chapel', 'Miss Brinville [declared] there was nothing worth seeing' therein. It is safely picturesque, yet with the priests merely moved elsewhere on the estate, remains soaked in Catholic claims. Juliet shows enduring curiosity when she attempts to flee the resurgence of Mrs Ireton's demands:

> Offended, indignant; escaped, yet without safety; free, yet without refuge; Juliet, hurried into the noble mansion, with no view but to find an immediate hiding-place, where, unseen, she might allow some vent to her wounded feelings, and, unmarked, remain till the haughty party should be gone, and she could seek some humble conveyance for her own return.
> Concluding her in haste for some commission of Mrs Ireton's, the servants let her pass nearly unobserved; and she soon came to a long gallery, hung with genealogical tables of the Arundel family, and with various religious reliques, and historical curiosities.[139]

[134] Roger Lonsdale, *Charles Burney: A Literary Biography (*Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 366.
[135] Lonsdale, *Charles Burney*, 398.
[136] William Hague, *William Pitt the Younger* (London: Harper, 2004), 419-20.
[137] Ibid.
[138] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 537.
[139] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 551.

'Believing herself alone,' she is instead confronted with Lady Aurora (later revealed to be her half-sister). They are soon joined by Lord Melbury, who laments Aurora's 'genealogical studies have lost [her] a most beautiful sea-view.'[140] His arrival and subsequent claims of protection in turn spark Mrs Maple's threats of imprisonment in the castle. Interest in genealogical studies brings the half-siblings together, and forces them to turn away from the channel and its mix of 'beautiful sea-views' and spectre of France, and towards a Howard family history and contested definitions of Englishness. Indeed, Juliet's wanderings through the castle represent an attempt to seek her own identity in this space of liberal Anglicanism. Her desire to visit the chapel and consult the genealogy of a family whose conversions between Catholicism and Protestantism mirror Burney's attempts to find a via media, and only underscore the enduring claims of Catholicism on Britain. Her imprisonment by Mrs Howel by turn, demonstrates both the violent ahistorical nature of Anglican Womanhood, but also its intolerance to the 'via media' which it claims, and its narrow antagonism to the realities of a landscape where, as on the Arundel Estates, the Catholic population is always just out of sight.

Juliet's marginal position in society therefore mirrors that of both Charles Howard and Frances Burney. Shortly after her experience at Arundel, the mystery of her origins begins to unravel. Lord Denmeath is responsible for evicting her from the protection of Lady Aurora Granville and Lord Melbury. He had already 'threaten[ed] Juliet in a manner which indicates that he has knowledge about her and her situation which the reader does not.'[141] Juliet is then forced to flee to Gabrielle and the anonymity of London, from whom Sir Jaspar learns 'the secret of Juliet's birth.'[142] Ellis is in fact Juliet Granville, the legitimate if secret daughter of 'the earl of Melbury's only son, Lord Granville' and 'the orphaned and destitute Miss Powel.'[143] Miss Power did not survive long, and after seven years' education on the Tyne, Lord Granville brought her:

> to France, where Juliet was educated in a convent, with Gabriella, niece of Granville's friend, the bishop. Granville married again, and before he could bring himself to reveal his first marriage and his offspring, he died suddenly. Juliet's guardian, the bishop, told Lord Denmeath, brother of Granville's second wife, of the existence of

[140] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 558.
[141] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 321.
[142] Ibid.
[143] Ibid.

> the legitimate elder child. Lord Denmeath, interested in obtaining the whole of the inheritance for his sister and her heirs, repudiated the connection, but offered to pay Juliet off if she married and promised to remain in France. The Bishop was about to accompany Juliet to England to make her claim, when revolution broke out. In a fire at the chateau, all the relevant documents were destroyed, except Lord Denmeath's promissory note.[144]

Juliet had maintained her fluency in English in the convent thanks to her grandmother, 'who entered the convent as a pensioner. In addition to books, Juliet had therefore perfectly retained her native tongue, though she had acquired something of a foreign accent.'[145] Juliet therefore has a clear Catholic background. Nevertheless, as she affirms to a surprised Lord Denmeath, she is 'firmly a Protestant! But, as such, I am a Christian; so, and most piously, yet not illiberally, is the Bishop.'[146] Juliet who, like Burney, comes from Catholic heritage, spent some ten years on the continent, and has returned with an accent that is neither French or English.[147] Moreover, in a nod both to Burney's maternal heritage, Alex's patrilineal line, and the Duke's conversion, she has chosen Anglicanism over and above the Catholicism of her milieu – yet she sees no reason that such a choice should entail rejecting the confessional choice of her friends and family. Catholics are, or can be, 'piou[s]' Christians. *The Wanderer* and Burney's wider dilemma is therefore what, exactly, constitutes legitimacy in the wake of contested descent. But in a wider sense, it allies polite Protestant identity with its linear loyalties with a suspiciously Revolutionary enlightenment ideology.

Although Hume's political and historical philosophy has been a constant theme in Burney's previous novels, here she engages most closely with his theory of legitimacy. As Knud Haakonssen summarises, contemporary freedom was neither 'ancient, nor based upon popular contractual consent.'[148] Rather, it depended on a delicate relationship between crown and individuals in parliament, which 'was not helped by charged language, bogus theory and false history of the political factions.'[149] Nevertheless, as Hume intimates, such legitimacy remained fraught. The Hanoverians have 'begot a title' only due to their 'mildness, equity and regard to the laws and constitution.' If these are broken, Hume thus argues, then the question of a new 'disputed title' would arise. *The Wanderer* echoes this Humean discourse

[144] Ibid.
[145] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 643.
[146] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 615-6.
[147] Chisholm, *Fanny Burney,* 222.
[148] Knud Haakonssen 'Introduction' in Knud Haakonssen, ed. *Hume's Political Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, 2006), xi – xxxi, xx-i.
[149] Ibid.

of legitimacy. Juliet's claims rest not just on her moral right to an inheritance through descent – tellingly championed by a Catholic priest – but also through her claim to Lord Denmeath that she is morally suited – via her Anglicanism - to be worthy of an inheritance that bestows a coherent British identity, all while acknowledging her Catholic roots. It is little wonder, then, that Juliet seeks solace in perusing the Howard family's genealogy or visiting the Catholic Chapel. As Alexander Lock and David Hume illuminate, the 11th Duke's ability to conform without denying the complexities of the past must provide comfort to Frances and Juliet while Mrs Ireton and Mrs Howel urge conformity and subjugation.

When Juliet escapes from her husband, a delighted Sir Jaspar sees his chance to instruct her in polite, Anglican conduct. Captured by her husband in an inn, she is about to be driven back to France when a 'horseman, holding out a paper, clapped him upon the shoulder, saying […] that he was to be sent out of the kingdom.'[150] Juliet, dazed, returns to the inn, only for a carriage to draw up with Sir Jaspar Harrington. 'Old Jaspar Harrington,' however:

> insists on taking her on a weird party of pleasure. They travel through the landscape that figured in two important journeys in Burney's life, once during the Thrale's escape from the Gordon Riots, again when she was recovering from her royal confinement. At Wilton, Sir Jaspar wants to imagine himself inside a painting by Salvator Rosa. At Stonehenge, he tries to realise his private dream of love with a picnic amid the gigantic ruins. He showers his companion with gifts; his wild talk about dallying with a nymph attended by fays and elves oppresses her[151]

Juliet, like Mortimer Delvile, is being asked to swear an oath abjuring her Catholic family. Julie Epstein argues that the French Revolution serves as a 'all-pervasive backdrop to the novel', embodied in the 'unnamed character' of Juliet's husband, 'a dark, maniacal, Gothic figure of terror.'[152] Juliet's 'radical namelessness' Epstein clarifies, permits Burney to sublimate 'Political […] into the personal.'[153] Sir Jaspar's 'weird party of pleasure' is therefore an attempt to woo Juliet by showing her a sanitised version of history that can contrast with the Jacobin terror and Catholic heritage represented by her husband and grandmother.

[150] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 733.
[151] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 361.
[152] Epstein, *The Iron Pen,* 176.
[153] Epstein, *The Iron Pen,* 177.

Juliet, however, deaded by the experience of the Revolution, is insensible to Hanoverian ideas of historical progress. The Earl of Pembroke's residence at Wilton was a sociable space noted for its extensive sculptural and artistic collections.[154] Juliet, however, was in no mood to see the delightful sculptures however, with as little 'desire to see as to be seen. Yet as Sir Jasper walked on, 'addressing himself to his *Cicerone*, whom he kept at his side,' and with 'no female in view', she was forced to follow. But while her 'soul' usually 'never saw excellence without emotion' now 'she followed; but as one to whom every thing was indifferent':

> Figures of the noblest sculpture; busts of historical interest; *alto* and *basso relievos* of antique elegance; marbles, alabasters, spars, and lavers of all colours, and in all forms; pictures glowing into life, and statues appearing to command their beholders;—all that, at another period, would have made her forget every thing but themselves, now vainly solicited a moment of her attention.
>
> […] He suffered her not to pass an Æsculapius, without demanding a prescription for her health; a Mercury, without supplicating an ordonnance for her spirits; a Minerva, without claiming an exhortation to courage; nor a Venus, without pointing out, that perpetual beauty beams but through perpetual smiles: couching every phrase under emblematical recommendations of story-subjects for the nursery. [155]

Jasper's aim, naturally, is to induct her into an Anglican history and culture, to give her the crash course to subsist in polite spaces that she missed during her years in France. Malcolm Baker argues Pembroke was 'a homosocial space,' in which 'polite sociability' could be performed among the [mostly male] gentry.[156] Wilton's statues and art, amassed over three generations, had been famous enough to be targeted by Alexander Pope in his *Epistle to Burlington* of 1731.[157] Naturally, a vibrant literature of guidebooks aided visitors to the collections in the public rooms. As the foreword to *Aedes Pembrochianae* (1788) demonstrates, the polite visitor had 'neither leisure nor inclination to travel over the craggy

---

[154] George Augustus Herbert, the 11th Earl (1759 – 1827) acceded to the title in January 1794 having been a reluctant Whig MP and enthusiastic officer in the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. In 1802, he married the daughter of the Russian Ambassador.
S.M. Farrell "Herbert, George Augustus, Eleventh Earl of Pembroke and Eighth Earl of Montgomery (1759–1827), Army Officer and Landowner." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* 2009. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-13026.

[155] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 759.
[156] Malcolm Baker, '"For Pembroke Statues, Dirty Gods and Coins" : The Collecting, Display, and Uses of Sculpture at Wilton House', *Studies in the History of Art*, Vol. 70, Symposium Papers XLVII: Collecting Sculpture in Early Modern Europe (2008), 378-395, 389.
[157] Alexander Pope, 'Epistle to Burlington', *The Major Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 242-20, l.8.

roads of antiquity without a clue to guide them, without some book to direct them, or some person to inform them.'[158] Beginning with an aborted project by William Stukely, via Cary Creed and Carlo Gamberini, to James Kennedy, Baker argues that the guidebooks to Wilton 'display an ambiguity about their format, function, and readership' which means we should see them less as 'cognate texts' but rather 'interrelated groups of descriptions.'[159] Nevertheless, the one thing these had in common, Baker argues, was the disjunction between the antiquarian focus of the guidebooks and the 'sculpture[s which] featured prominently as an integrated component of the whole' and the 'more modern works' in the house. In other words, the cicerone or guidebook instructed the polite actor in a reading of European history which would otherwise be illegible. Just as Hanoverian apologists strove to assert unity and progression over the disjunction of 1688, so too did the guidebooks attempt to create a narrative from artefacts ripped out of their material contexts. These guidebooks were analogous to courtesy literature. Moreover, just as popular literature aestheticized mansions and castles shattered by the penal laws into proof of Catholic tyranny, so too did these texts prompt the viewer to understand Britain as the apotheosis of classical liberty and freedom. Sir Jaspar therefore attempts to demonstrate the supremacy of British history and the promises of Anglican womanhood. For Juliet however, who has experienced the horror of the Terror at first hand, British claims to supremacy and historical progress are no longer credible.

What does raise her interest, however, is her realisation that Britain has undergone a violent revolution:

> even in this nearly torpid state, accident having raised her eyes to Vandyke's children of Charles the First, the extraordinary attraction of that fascinating picture, was exciting, unconsciously, some pleasure, when the sound of a carriage announcing a party to see the house, she petitioned Sir Jaspar to avoid, if possible, being known.[160]

This portrait was not at Wilton but had instead been purchased by King George III in 1765.[161] Frances Burney would have been familiar with the work, hanging as it did at Windsor Castle during her tenure at court. Burney therefore paints a troubling picture of enduring Stuart legitimacy. But this is pointedly not a picture of the executed King, but rather of his five

[158] Baker, 'For Pembroke', 390.
[159] Baker, 'For Pembroke', 392
[160] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 760.
[161] See https://www.rct.uk/collection/404405/the-five-eldest-children-of-charles-i

children. It is therefore Britain's attempts to make sense of its own revolution and impose order over violence which leads Ellis to 'some pleasure' as she recognises the violence which lurks beneath the veneer of polite spaces such as Wilton. Yet such recognition is not restorative or reassuring. Just as in Burney's previous books, the dissolution of polite spaces cannot lead back to a purer, anti-diluvian social order, but only further intrusion and the threat of death. If the French Revolution was founded on Constitutional attempts to re-create the freedoms of England after the Glorious Revolution, then Burney here reminds the reader that Hanoverian society was still profoundly fragile. Indeed, the French and Glorious revolutions both fail because any shattering of the status quo will lead inexorably to mass violence.

Indeed, Juliet seems to relax only when she understands the poverty of grand historical narratives. When Mrs Ireton enters, Sir Jasper and Juliet make their escape. First, they lodge with a farmer, before setting off the next day on what Sir Jasper claims is a last-minute meeting with his valet. Instead, Juliet noticed:

> the scattered remains of some ancient building, vast, irregular, strange, and in ruins. […]
> The beauties of Wilton seemed appendages of luxury, as well as of refinement; and appeared to require not only sentiment, but happiness for their complete enjoyment: while the nearly savage, however wonderful work of antiquity, in which she was now rambling; placed in this abandoned spot, far from the intercourse, or even view of mankind, with no prospect but of heath and sky; blunted, for the moment, her sensibility, by removing her wide from all the objects with which it was in contact; and insensibly calmed her spirits; though not by dissipating her reverie. Here, on the contrary, was room for 'meditation even to madness;' nothing distracted the sight, nothing broke in upon attention, nor varied the ideas. Thought, uninterrupted and uncontrouled, was master of the mind.[162]

The ruins of Stonehenge elicit the same positive reaction in Juliet as Van Dyck's portrait of the Stuarts. Sir Jasper is soon at hand to provide the correct gloss. He supposes she believes herself 'in the original temple of gog and magog? For what less than giants could have heaved such stones.' Yet she, 'who [is] pious, must view this spot, with bended knees and new ideas' as 'in each stony spectre, now staring you in the face, a petrified old Druid! for learn, fair fugitive, you ramble now within the holy precincts of that rude wonder of other days, and disgrace of modern geometry, Stonehenge.' Juliet returned 'to the very beginning

[162] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 765-6.

of things' and found solace. Her vision is of a landscape with 'mossy ruins' where '[h]ere and there flew a bustard, or a wheat-ear; all else seemed unpeopled air, and uncultivated waste.' This reading of a countryside populated by ruins lost to interpretation at last 'calmed her spirits; though not by dissipating her reverie' to the point of a quasi-Romantic encounter with the sublime. At last Sir Jaspar admits that his attempts at narration are nothing more than fancy. His talk of 'petrified druid[s]' stems from 'the idea of being the object of some marvellous adventure […] to visit some romantic spot […] there to encounter a lovely nymph.' Burney thus rejects utterly the use of ruins, statues, and art to legitimate history as nothing more than the ridiculous romantic fancies of the elderly. As Doody argues in pointing to the Regency tropes in play here, for Burney 'all history […] is attached ultimately to myth, and the roots of all story, […] lie in mythological time.'[163] But more than that, to return to *Camilla's* introduction, Burney believes that it is ultimately futile to attempt discern personal motivations. Without such knowledge, only broad historical strokes are possible. Like Hume, she affirms that echoes of romantic legitimacy bring only further violence, and even older ruins resist interpretations. Historical conceptions of British identity, Burney ultimately argues, are nothing more than the ridiculous fancy of elderly men, starved of adventure.

The figure of Elinor Joddrel then encapsulates Burney's scepticism towards enlightenment dreams of the emancipated woman. Elinor is 'a mixed figure, a revolutionary and a romantic. Influenced by the French ideal of égalité, she considers herself free to declare her love.'[164] Unfortunately, the object of her affection is Harleigh, who is in love with Juliet. Despite Juliet's repeated denials 'like Edgar Mandlebert, Elinor becomes a watcher, tormentingly suspicious of any connection between Ellis and Albert Harleigh.'[165] Elinor believes not only in her power to shape her own marriage prospects then, but believes that it is her sociable identity that permits this. In other words, Elinor's actions rest less in outré Francophilia but the same beliefs that bedevilled Evelina, Cecilia, and Camilla. This, of course, are interconnected. Like the maritime salon, but also like Captain Mirvan, Elinor believes that outward behaviour reflects inward predispositions. Yet as *Camilla's* narrator points out, such an attempt is impossible.[166] Elinor's psychodrama should therefore be place not just within the literature of the French Revolution, but simultaneously within the ideology of sociability.

[163] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 364. Juliet is terrified by the prospect of performance, intensified 'from her dislike to being seen, her eyes seemed rivetted upon the music paper she held in her hand.'
[164] Janice Farrar Thaddeus, *Frances Burney: A Literary Life* (Basingstoke: MacMillan, 2000), 163.
[165] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 338.
[166] Burney, *Camilla,* 7.

Elinor first attempt at suicide reflects her horrified realisation of the fragility of identity. Elinor learns that Harleigh is to be in the audience at Juliet's recital. On the way, Juliet sees 'A strange figure, with something foreign in his appearance,' but a 'humble friend' explained that he 'would disturb nobody, for he was deaf and dumb, and very inoffensive.'[167] The figure remains troubling. Though at first distracted by her own fear, her 'music-paper which she held in her hand' and Harleigh's 'disponding look', she finally faints as 'the foreign clothing of the man' prompts 'an horrible surmise occurred that it was Elinor disguised, and Elinor come to perpetrate the bloody deed of suicide.'[168] Although 'she plunged a dagger into her breast […] a surgeon of eminence, who was accidentally in the assembly' was able to stop the bleeding, and Elinor survives.[169] Again, metaphors and settings of theatricality represent the traumatic pressures of sociability. While Evelina's accession into the audience signals the maturity of her constructed identity, the theatre here serves as the place where Elinor's identity unravels. As Harleigh understands, performing will engender 'a loss of caste', transforming Juliet from private to public property.[170] In 'bridging the gap between professional performance and gentility,' moreover Juliet will 'cloud my dearest hopes [as] I have relations who have never deserved to forfeit my consideration.'[171] Elinor's spectacle disrupts this transition through displaying her own malleability. As Stephanie Russo argues, Juliet 'essentially dresses up as a Frenchman in order to stage her public suicide attempt.'[172] Yet her costume is not meant to be fool proof; Juliet and Harleigh are supposed to recognise her and to understand that their supposed love affair has driven her to death. Elinor's theatrical suicide therefore shows her demonstrating her failure to find stable, coherent identities through polite/enlightened ways of reading sociable spaces. Private sympathies will always remain maddeningly inscrutable, as Captain Mirvan had feared. Yet such social mutability grants no enlightenment, only death. Juliet, about to 'bridge the gap between professional performance and gentility' learns in turn that such a public transformation leads

[167] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 356.
[168] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 357 – 9.
[169] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 360.
[170] Gillian Skinner, 'Professionalism, Performance and Private Theatricals in Frances Burney's 'The Wanderer'', *Romanticism,* Vol.18 No. 3, 294-305, 302.
[171] Ibid.
[172] Stephanie Russo, 'Ovid was a mere fool to you': Clothing and Nationality in Frances Burney's The Wanderer', *Sydney Studies in English,* Vol. 41 (2015), 31 – 46, 42.

not to a degree of freedom, but to the social and economic bankruptcy which drove Mr Harrel to a similarly public suicide.

Elinor's second suicide attempt demonstrates the futility of rational history. Arranging a dawn meeting in a graveyard, she tells Harleigh to expect Juliet, and Juliet to expect Gabriella. Juliet sees 'a female figure gliding through the churchyard,' and assumes it is her fellow émigré come to mourn her child.[173] The 'form in white, whose dress appeared to be made in the shape, and of the materials, used for our mortal covering, a shroud' beckons them into the church:[174]

> The fugitive entered the church, and darted towards the altar; where she threw her left hand over a tablet of white stone, cut in the shape of a coffin, with the action of embracing it; yet in a position to leave evident the following inscription:
>
> 'This Stone
> Is destined by herself to be the last kind covering
> of all that remains of
> ELINOR JODDREL:
> Who, sick of Life, of Love, and of Despair,
> Dies to moulder, and be forgotten.'[175]

Harleigh 'suspicious of some sinister purpose' overpowers her, and diverts the pistol from her temple, though 'the loud din of the pistol, so close to her ear' made her believe 'her purpose was fulfilled.'[176] Elinor is clear that her belief in the agency of women stems from her time in France, having been 'ordered there to attempt to recover from the emotional turmoil of being engaged to (Albert) Harleigh's brother, Dennis, whom she did not love'.[177] Elinor, then, 'is not merely eccentric [but] her mental health is compromised'.[178] She understands that people think 'me, I know, tarnished by those revolutionary ideas through which, in my own estimation, I am ennobled,' but she is equally clear that it is not the revolutionary ideas which have disturbed her, but instead her experience of the 'tyrant [that]

[173] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 340.
[174] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 579
[175] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 579-60.
[176] Ibid.
[177] Victoria Kortes-Papp 'Madness as Shelter for Feminist Ideas: Elinor's Role in Frances Burney's The Wanderer.' *Lumen*, Vol. 18, (1999) 95–106, 97.
[178] Ibid.

is custom.'[179] In other words, she traces her mania not just to Revolutionary France, but to her experience of their presence in English society. As Tara Ghoshal Walsh argues, 'the spirit of Mary Wollstonecraft inhabits Frances Burney's *The Wanderer*,' but not in the critical manner in which it has often been read.[180] Instead, Walsh suggests that if Elinor 'rather crudely parodies Wollstonecraft's revolutionary fervour in the character of Elinor Joddrel' then it concurrently 'enacts a strategy for domesticating and assimilating into genteel society the progressive ideology of this difficult and polarizing icon of revolutionary romanticism.'[181] Yet while Burney may represent 'the limits of both revolutionary romanticism and conservative patriarchy,' the trauma endured clearly points to a more complicated picture.[182] Elinor in fact represents Burney's untrammelled id. Traumatised by forced marriage, proto-feminist texts promise 'enfranchisement from the mental slavery of subscribing to unexamined opinions.' Returning from France, however, she is only confronted with what Evelina already knows; the futility of reversal. Nevertheless, having discovered 'all history is ultimately myth,' she delves into constant reinvention, first theatrically, and then historically, in her invocation of sectarian violence through the gothic. Yet as Doody points out, 'Elinor is insistently physical,' and 'relations between female mind and body […] are literalised. Metaphors become reality, as they had done for Burney.'[183] As such, her constantly 'theatrical' suicide attempts thus become less mockery of Wollstonecraft's own mental health crises, but rather forceful encounters with the lies of history. That is, in the wake of understanding the contingency and crises of 1688 and the trauma of the terror, the radical mutability of history and identity returns, always, to the new reality of the sexed body.

Burney ultimately argues that it is better to accept the fictions of British history and find some protection under a suitable husband and King than to be driven mad by their contradictions. Harleigh repeatedly attempts to aid Juliet by offering himself as her protector and suitor. Yet her inability to divulge enough about herself for fear that she will be identified and reclaimed by her husband means Harleigh is unable to offer her a way into society. The clearest indication of this is when he begs her not to perform on stage, as while he claims no

[179] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 173, 174.
[180] Tara Ghoshal Walsh, 'Rewriting Radicalism: Wollstonecraft in Burney's The Wanderer', *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* Vol. 24, No. 3 (Spring 2012) 487 – 508, 487.
[181] Walsh, 'Rewriting Radicalism', 488-9.
[182] Walsh, 'Rewriting Radicalism', 507.
[183] Doody, *Frances Burney,* 343-4.

'prejudices' about such behaviour, his own place in society is dependent on 'ties from which we are never emancipated, ties which cling to our nature' – that of family.[184] Indeed, Harleigh is frozen by his awareness of the contingency of his own identity. He 'lacks the power to rescue Juliet from her troubles. As she contracts, through no fault of her own, more and more debt, Harleigh can only offer to transfer her debts to himself.'[185] When he learns that she is married, he 'appeared to be lost' and mournfully 'dragged himself back to his apartment.'[186] He appears again at the point of her husband's arrest, still able only to be 'aloof and disconsolate, fixed like a statue, upon a small planted eminence.'[187] Yet while Jordan argues that Harleigh's General d'Arblayesque sympathy 'causes a diminution of traditional power,' this is not exactly the case. [188] Nor is Skinner's assertion that he is 'hamstrung by his determination to abide by the prejudices of his family and rank.'[189] Harleigh cannot singlehandedly overturn the social order. To do so would be treasonous, and risk even deeper bloodshed. What he can do however is to demonstrate repeatedly that his own virtue is enough to mitigate these social hypocrisies.

Christian theology and virtue however can offer an uncertain way out of both French atheism and polite hypocrisy. Elinor asserts that 'Reason, philosophy, analogy, all prove our materialism.'[190] Harleigh counters that her 'disbelief of the immortality of the soul, is founded on your inability to have it, visually, or orally, demonstrated.' Often, 'age, even the oldest, escape any previous decay of intellect! There are records extant, of those who, after attaining their hundredth year, have been capable of bearing testimony in trials.' Again, Burney returns to the problem of trusting to appearances. It is impossible to make a snap judgement about loyalty, virtue, or faith based only on the external characteristics of that person. Elinor's attempts to divine the true nature of Juliet and Harleigh through observation are therefore impossible. Even a long-standing surveillance will reveal only a web of material culture. Her error is to believe that politeness is to learn a stable series of social relationships; in other words, she 'trusts to appearances' when politeness is, despite its reliance about fashionable commerce is about 'not trusting to appearances'. A true investigation of private

[184] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 338-9.
[185] J. Kevin Jordan, *Revisiting Stonehenge: Marriage, Masculinity, And Burney's Sentimental Hero In The Wanderer* [Unpublished MA thesis], University of Florida, 2003, 27.
[186] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 730.
[187] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 736.
[188] J. Kevin Jordan, *Revisiting Stonehenge,* 27.
[189] Skinner, 'Professionalism and Performance', 302.
[190] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 784.

loyalties will always be impossible. Harleigh, however, demonstrates his virtue by demonstrating that he understands this. The body may wither, but the mind often 'escape[s] any previous decay of intellect', and the fact that it can do so proves that private sympathy and judgement can differ from its social manifestations. Material, in other words, is not the mind. Outward appearances are not reflections of private virtues. His willingness to 'transfer the debts to himself' therefore points to his understanding of the complexities of social credit, of offering his putative wife Christian shelter from the economic and social instability in society.

Burney therefore ends *The Wanderer* with an begrudging acknowledgement of using moderate Christian virtue to navigate social spaces. The acknowledgement of 'fellow-feeling; which bind us to our family' for Juliet is, naturally, a clear sign of resolution. Juliet is first called 'address[ed] as 'Miss Granville? The Honourable Miss Granville?' shortly after her husband has been arrested by an officer of the peace. This interrogative naming is followed in short order by the affirmation of familial obligation in a reversal of the naming that disinherited Cecilia Delvile, the:

> 'dulcet commission,' he continued, 'to escort her to her brother and sister, Lord Melbury, and Lady Aurora Granville.'
> […]
> 'Oh take me, then, at once,—this instant,—this moment,—take me to them, my benevolent, my noble friend! If, indeed, I have a brother, a sister,—give me the heaven of their protection!—'[191]

As Julia Epstein argues, the 'nine months […] elapsed since the novels opening' sees 'Juliet born into her true name. Like a new-born and like Mary Shelley's monster in Frankenstein when he acquires language, Juliet is enthralled by the new kinship and identity terms she can claim.'[192] This therefore 'is the climactic moment when the plot begins to resolve itself.'[193] But several plot points still remain. After the failure of Sir Jasper's attempts to build on her naming with historical narratives of Britishness, 'Juliet makes her way to Teignmouth, where Lady Aurora and Lord Melbury defy Lord Denmeath and acknowledge her as their sister.' A family name allows her to build a historical genealogy, even if Burney reminds the reader of fictional quality of such stories of historical naming. Yet having received news that her

[191] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 735 – 6.
[192] Epstein, *The Iron Pen*, 182.
[193] Ibid.

husband has captured the bishop and is holding him hostage, she 'determines to return' to France, only for the boat that threatens 'public and private horrors' to return with better news. Again, this information is given authority by being spoken by Harleigh, who 'more composedly,' than Juliet, recounted not only how the 'execrable commissary' had been seized and executed by the French state, but is in turn interrupted by Lord Melbury to reassure the Admiral that 'a forced, interrupted, and unfinished lay ceremony' did not constitute a valid marriage 'either in sight of the church, or of her own conscience.'[194] First an aged baronet, then Harleigh, then the admiral, and finally her brother together construct the necessary patriarchal networks for Anglican womanhood. Yet even here Burney acknowledges the fragility of that identity; the textual webs which bind society and man and wife together are as fragile as they were when Sir John Belmont burnt his certificate of marriage. It is all, as the Admiral himself admits, a matter of the right Christian 'discipline.' Once more Burney points to the corresponding fragility of women's legal identity. While before the only hint that the marriage was invalid was its lack of consummation, here Burney shows the power of the patriarchal gaze to regularise any irregular situation, no matter the legality. While this might appear to counteract Harleigh's argument that he is unable to go against the wishes of his relatives, it is important to note that Juliet's marriage can be declared invalid only after her husband has disappeared and she has been named by a hierarchy of men. Once this has been done, Harleigh is free to take possession. Declaiming, 'Miss Ellis! most beloved Miss Granville! My own,—at length! at length! my own sweet Juliet!' he names first her pseudonym, and then her legitimate maiden name. Having named her virginity, he is free claim her as 'my own sweet Juliet.' She can, at last, be owned.

This therefore appears to support a version of Zonitch's argument that Burney's 1814 novel is a rewriting of 1778's *Evelina.* Yet as we have already seen, contra Zonitch, Burney had already 'enter[ed] into an impassioned debate about the future of English society' in her sympathetic treatment of Madame Duval.[195] Nevertheless, the Admiral's statements, first that Juliet's husband's Catholicism is not necessarily a barrier to him 'be[ing[a tolerable good Christian, for a papist' and secondly that always had a proper respect for a parson, 'whether he be of the true religion, or only a Papist,' a sentiment intensified when he learns that the Bishop is fluent in English, clearly represent a boldness in Burney's ecumenicism. In the

[194] Burney, *The Wanderer,* 856.
[195] Barbara Zonitch *Familiar Violence: Gender and Social Upheaval in the Novels of Frances Burney* (London: University of Delaware Press, 1997), 113.

final wedding scene moreover, Burney articulates the strongest acknowledgement of the contingency of Anglican identity against territory.

> When the desert was served, the joyous Admiral, filling up a bumper of ale, and rising, said, 'Ladies and gentlemen, I shall now make free to propose two toasts to you: the first, as in duty bound, is to the King and the Royal Navy. I always put them together; because why? I hold our King to be our pilot, without whom we might soon be all aground; and, in like manner, I hold us tars to be the best part of his majesty's ship's company; for though old England, to my seeming, is at the top of the world, if we tars were to play it false, it would soon pop to the bottom. So here goes to the King and the Royal Navy!'[196]

At first glance, the admiral's toast appears to be solidly conservative. Yet at closer inspection, the King's authority is not as firm as it appears. Firstly, he re-iterates his ecumenical identity, placing himself alongside Juliet, her brother, and her guardian - the man who protected her freely chosen Protestant faith as the Catholic French state crumbled around him. He then blesses an ale which, along with 'good roast beef', he had determined to feed the French refugees arriving with the bishop to welcome them to England. This quasi-Roussean sentiment on the flexibility of national identity is soon followed by an odd comparison of the King to 'our pilot, without whom we might soon be run aground.' In other words, he locates the King's legitimacy in the knowledge of the local territory, a simile which carries with it the threat of un-English behaviour. Meanwhile, the invocation of the Royal Navy and the ever-present spectre of the channel, alongside the material qualities of Britishness, point to Burney having found an ecumenical, cultural foundation to Anglicanism. With this final happy affirmation taking place after a marriage, Julie Park's assessment of *The Wanderer* bucking the trend of the 'weak and ambiguous closure' in Burney's first three marriages seems apt. [197]Yet the Admiral's contingency-ridden speech forces a clarification. The post-revolution world, Burney ultimately argues, has shown history, culture, nation, and confession come unstuck. It is only the traditional structure of marriage which can regularise an irregular situation, and provide some safety for women from the violence that, even here, lurks among the 'tars' or across a maritime border only tentatively protected by the Navy.

In drawing parallels between the ideology of Revolutionary France and eighteenth-century England, *The Wanderer* reflects Macauley's fears that Frances had returned alienated from

[196] Burney, *The Wanderer*, 868.
[197] Julie Parks, *The Self and It: Novel Objects in Eighteenth-Century England*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010), 132.

her decade in Napoleonic France. While it would be reductive to direct parallels between Burney and Juliet, the similarities are striking. Both refused to fit into crystallising binaries of English/other, white/black, or indeed male/female. In so doing, they problematise the sociable marketplace through belying the supposedly natural qualities of those distinctions. The polite and commercial people were not intrinsically polite, nor commercial. Yet much Hanoverian legitimacy rested on this supposedly natural quality. Hanoverian polite identity, to reiterate, both relied on this sociable marketplace to create social order, and implied that the aesthetic, national, gendered, and moral choices made under that system were natural. Burney argued in this final work that French and British thought in the 18th century rested on a belief that observation of material qualities could represent

Juliet's experience in the boat shows English society attempting to work out her place in society. The maritime salon's attempts to impose race on Juliet/Ellis thus link back to the imposition of 'pure' lineages of family and nation which in fact stretch across nations and confessions, and which are only defined through bloody struggle. Both Juliet and Elinor struggle to come to terms with their position in this society, whether via French Philosophy which promises female emancipation or Juliet's attempts to preserve her privacy. Elinor finds her attempts to turn her knowledge of how society works into agency just as traumatic as Cecilia's anagnorisis. Juliet, too, refuses to either lie or divulge her family ties, and finds herself outside these polite spaces. The results are predictably horrifying, with both women – and therefore both French enlightenment, and Hanoverian politeness – discovering the poverty of this self-sustaining surveillance.

If *The Wanderer* can be said to be a rewriting of *Evelina,* then it must also be seen as a rewriting of *Cecilia*, and *Camilla* in Juliet/Ellis's attempts to acknowledge the economic, violent, and patriarchal roots of society and use that knowledge to navigate. In her failure, in which she experiences the utter lack of economic and social credit which Smith argued bound society together, Burney is at her least novel but most explicit. Indeed, once we stop looking for novelty of heroine and plot – i.e if we stop reading Burney's texts as novels – and instead understand them as dialogues, conversations, both with herself and society, this return makes more sense. *The Wanderer* is in turn a return to *Evelina* in the sense of an ultimate ability to negotiate a relatively stable life between King, Christ, and family. While Juliet's role in the novel is to be unplaceable, her very inability to be categorised revealing how the French Revolution unpicked the ignorance of religious difference and violent revolt on which

Anglican moderation depended, Burney nevertheless grants her the happiest of all her endings. Indeed, this represents Burney's own ultimate happiness, as a happy and supportive marriage of equals with her French Roman Catholic husband is balanced by an enduring and sustaining friendship with the Queen and Princesses.

Conclusion

This thesis' original contribution to knowledge is therefore twofold. Firstly, it argues that Frances Burney's writing was deeply engaged with questions of religion and nation. Contra established scholarship, Burney's Catholic sympathies and her reading of David Hume and Adam Smith were formative to her social criticism. In comparison to existing Burney scholarship, this thesis tracks an obsession with sovereignty, legitimacy, and the limits of religious toleration. Secondly, her description of polycentric, contextual, and shifting identities reveals the struggle to consolidate Hanoverian legitimacy and coherent national identity on Britain endured long after the Jacobite threat had subsided. To echo Colley, Burney's fiction points to the existence of a plurality of shifting and contestable national and local identities. Yet the choice of how and when to perform each one was not the subject's own.

Contra established Burney scholarship this thesis has shown how Burney's fiction is obsessed with the gendered violence of national identity. For women from families who held enough capital to gain access to sociable spaces, adolescence was a time of instruction. Conduct literature, such as that by Mrs Ord, Mrs Chapone, and Hannah More which peppered Burney's young journals, acted to instil and naturalise complex historical, philosophical, and theological positions. They taught young women not just how to shape and improve polite conversation but how shed the material and historical contexts of their families and locations in favour of an idealised, reified Anglican womanhood. Burney's bildungsroman point to the traumatic experiences of attempting to reconcile polite identity with the material realities of these sociable spaces. Young women were supposed to ensure participants avoided discussion of religious and material divisions or realising the terrifying precariousness of a social order predicated on consumption and performance. Learning to be polite was therefore as much a matter of ensuring non-Anglican relatives and their histories then were cut out of the newly defined national family as it was avoiding the discussion of debt. The Hanoverian regime therefore naturalised its interconnectedness with moderate liberty and historical progress by ensuring other alternatives were unthinkable and inexpressible. Yet if Hume's suggestion was that Hanover had earned its claim by managing to reign over a peaceful and

commercial people, then Burney points out that such a 'claim' was contested with each perilous social interaction. Burney's family plots in turn ally genealogy with making sense of the rupture of Protestant Succession. Catholic relatives threatened to remind the polite subject of the messiness of national history and thus the fragility of Hanoverian rule. In response, religious identities or histories which might explain lack of capital, or unwillingness to participate in the ostentation of fashion were reduced to miserliness at best, and tacit explanations of Catholic authoritarianism at worst.

While Smith and Hume as Burgess suggests, argued that a sociable marketplace could replace the great chain of being disrupted by 1688, Burney remains sceptical. Rather than generating webs of interdependence and mutual understanding, the lack of absolute marks of value in the move away from land to a market-economy permanently endangers the social order. Politeness meanwhile lacks the vocabulary to adequately describe markers of religious and social difference which might appear. Nor is it able to confront or even mitigate the patriarchal violence and corruption intrinsic to the new world order. The gendered character of British national identity is critical. Men who have sufficient economic or social capital are able to silence speech, subvert the law, and siphon capital from women who, despite the promises of Anglican womanhood, find themselves reduced to pure capital with only the thin veneer of agency. The hope for interdependence therefore fails, because those with power simply deny obligations of debt and marriage. Hanoverian society is therefore in a state of permanent crisis. Yet the prospect of the fracturing of the fragile social marketplace risks a terrifying intensification. It is this paradox which terrifies and troubles Burney throughout her life.

Polite identity, too, was troublingly paradoxical in its promises and denials of agency within conservative boundaries. As others have demonstrated, it was an embodied phenomenon.[1] This thesis has also shown how the purported role of women in knitting together society was clear well before the Jacobin threat. But as Burney argued, the Anglican directions for

[1] I.e Alun Withey, *Technology, Self-Fashioning, and Politeness in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016)

women to bridge social and economic differences, spend their capital through charity, and thereby embody and naturalise Anglican, Hanoverian ideals was complicated by their reduction to signifiers of value, their inability to access their own capital, and ever-present threat of patriarchal violence which permeated this sociable marketplace. The question of separate spheres, which continues to inform the discussion of women's history is therefore as problematic as other attempts to find a distinct character of British identity. Nevertheless, the distinction between the home and the public sphere remains important, if transformed into a distinction between familial and sociable identity. Questions of public and private gendered spheres are not a question of physical space, or rather not just a question of location and commerce. Rather, they represent the intrusions of polite norms into the family, and women's ability or inability to influence or defend the realities of the household from this external reality, as well as cope with its pressures. As Helen Barry's work on the King's polite economic model suggests, polite embodiment was also inextricably bound up with the example of the King, and with the 'proof' of the legitimacy of the crown.[2] But it was also a matter of what politeness ignored as much as what it permitted. In other words, by its predication on the ignorance of religious and social differences, it brought those differences to the attention of its performer. By seeking out religious and social difference and moderating them in sociable spaces, the Anglican woman was forever placed at the paradoxical centre of a world in which the proof of discordant identities and histories revealed the unnaturalness of these sociable encounters.

Burney's pan-European and imperial families, whose members fan out around the globe only to bring back new peoples, cultures, and languages, point to a wider crisis in histories of nationalism. Miranda Burgess inter alia have fluently demonstrated how fictional families served as metaphors of legitimacy.[3] Yet such families remained troublingly international. Leslie Harcourt, for example, recently showed how the King and Queen relied on the cross-channel Harcourt family for news during the Revolutionary Wars.[4] The Princesses also took advantage of Frances' marriage to Alexandre to gain news and carry letters back and forth.[5]

[2] Helen Barry, 'The Pleasures of Austerity' *JECS*, 37:2 (2014), 261 – 277, 262
[3] Miranda J Burgess, *British Fiction and the Production of Social Order, 1740 – 1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 18.
[4] Leslie Mitchell, 'The Harcourts: Anglo-French Relations in a time of Revolution' in Elaine Chalus and Perry Gauci, eds. *Revisiting the Polite and Commercial People: Essays in Georgian Politics, Society, and Culture in Honour of Professor Paul Langford* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 207-221.
[5] See for example Princess Elizabeth to Mdme d'Arblay November 1814, Egerton MS 3699 Barrett Col A, British Library.

Discussion of families as metaphors for national identities must therefore grapple with the various branches within. Histories of kinship, in turn, must therefore be seen as adjacent to histories of nationality. Families were transnational networks whose own material and social cultures, mix of confessions and own histories belied the neat behavioural narratives of the conduct books. Polite material culture and authorised histories of Protestant supremacy were therefore dangerously at odds with family memory, kinships, and identity, whether in Frances' own relatives in France, her father's friendships and clients, or old Anglo-Norman aristocrats.

This description of an anarchic marketplace of form and credit, where grand historical narratives are repeatedly shown to be little more than fables, is reflected in Burney's experimentation with text and genre. Burney consistently argued that she did not write novels.[6] Rather than being solely a rejection of a form that was considered morally dangerous for women, we should take her assertion seriously. Burney's writing points to a recursive, self-reflective, and wide-ranging intertextual engagement with the complicated world around her. The distinction between text and paratext can no longer be fully upheld, and therefore it makes less sense to distinguish between fiction and non-fiction in book, letter, diary, biography, speech, and self. Just as the literary scholar should beware of reading the text divorced from its material conditions then, so too should the wider historian of nationalism, gender, and religion approach published work of whichever genre alongside traditional genres of political and historical theory, as Burney argues repeatedly that any attempt to impose a narrative on relics, ruins, or even a life is necessarily an act of curation.

This reading of Burney has therefore unsettled coherent understandings of national identity in the eighteenth century. While 'Britishness', 'politeness', and 'Anglicanism' are all inextricably bound up, to discuss something called 'British national identity' is difficult when it is dependent on a public, commercial performance directly at odds with, yet inextricable from, family life. In this sense then, we return to Brubakers' point on the difficulties of categorisation.[7] If we look for British national identity as the rise of a national consciousness, then we miss the extent to which it was imposed from above, less as a coherent identity but

[6] Brian McCrea, *Frances Burney and Narrative Prior to Ideology* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013), 4.
[7] Rogers Brubaker, *Ethnicity Without Groups* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 13-15.

rather a set of contextual clues, fashionable choices, and ways of speaking that sought to be seen as ontological truth which could be discerned through careful observation. To return to an old metaphor, we can say that identity was less a series of hats, but a series of uniforms which chafed and restricted, which promised freedoms and cut off its wearers from their families, clothes shed as soon as their wearers returned to their homes and families and sought to reknit connections rejected in the course of the day.

This thesis therefore builds on, rather than seeks to supersede, previous work on Frances Burney. Violence is, as her critics in the 1980s argued, a constant threat. [8]Yet as *Evelina* showed most explicitly, gendered violence is inextricable from sectarian and national violence. Captain Mirvan and Reverend Villars both seek to delineate the boundaries of acceptable, supposedly natural behaviour, to impose the facade of order on the vicissitudes of the marketplace. More broadly, this reading of Burney's life and writing demonstrates how a young woman of precarious family and identity was subject to pressure to deny the very attachments which supported her family's position. The late Hanoverian state continued to be in the process of violent nation-building, imposing itself on a population whose identities were trans-national, local, and contextual. The step back even further, Burney shows how questions of religion, identity, sovereignty, and religion - here glossed as Anglican Womanhood - cannot be disentangled. The attempts by historians of national identity and religion to uncover the 'true' character or essence of Britishness, as if Britishness was a platonic ideal is therefore misguided. If we seek to find a coherent platonic conception of Britishness in the period, we may find it. But we will also be doing the work of the Hanoverian state, following their propaganda as we impose a category on a populace which struggled to parse this new Protestant supremacy.

The trauma of 1688 is therefore foundational, haunting the eighteenth century well past the American and French crises which carry echoes of the Hanoverians original sin. George III is in no sense established. His legitimacy, pace Hume, depends on his social credit: the fact that British liberty, commerce, and protestant supremacy endure, that parliament and moderation are seen to work. In other words, the horror of reformation, counter reformation, civil wars,

[8] See chapter one.

and revolution are well in the past. Key to this is polite commerce. Relaxation of penal laws permitted Catholics, dissenters, Protestants to participate in the marketplace and therefore in society. Such sociability, pace Smith, Locke, and Hume, replaces the great chain of being and seeks to knit the new order together. Burney, however, argues that such moderation and 'naturalness' is enforced by the constant threat of male violence. Men are able to step outside the rule of law. Violence, or the threat of it, policies speech, and restricts women's agency. The language of politeness is not a common tongue, but a sociolect of Hanoverian supremacy, in which the violence of the past and the suffering of Catholics under the penal laws is ignored, and is instead accompanied by a material and social culture which sublimates this evidence into commercial choice. Burney, in other words, sees society as not interdependent, but troublingly fragile.

Worse, the logic of the sociable marketplace appears to lead to the violence it so fears. A Catholic family's attempts to use politeness to evade the marketplace in Cecilia leads only to blood and near death, and the risk of eradication. For young women, donning politeness, following conduct books, engaging with the marketplace leads to trauma, psychosis, and near death. The tumult of linking social and economic credit leads to suicide, disfigurement, and alienation. It is unable to keep the mob at bay. As Burney ages, she comes to reject the possibility advanced by some high church conservatives like Astell or proto feminists like Wollstonecraft that politeness, or Anglican ideals of charity and meekness, can be used to carve out any degree of political agency. If Evelina and Cecilia attain their desires - even at a price - Burney's time at court ironically glossed as a gothic, restrictive space, seems to have led her to reject the possibility of any degree of social change. It is ultimately only in the family, itself a hazardous and traumatic space, that the chance of negotiation with these frightening forces can be grasped.

This thesis has necessarily focussed on Frances Burney, and even then a narrow slice of her life in England and France. It ignored, for reasons of space and a methodology which focussed on her published work and the formative influence of a handful of authors and philosophers, a much wider intellectual milieu. Also missing is a conception of the colonial contexts of Burney's meditation on race and nation. Although Frances' approach to Burke via the Hastings Trial was briefly mentioned, this ignored both Captain Burney and Richard Burney's links to the imperial World. James Burney, for example, who had joined Cook's

journey through the Antarctic and around the world, acted as a translator for a Tahitian visitor to London. Frances met Omai several times, commenting on his race, and the influence of the pacific on the material culture of the family and their friends.[9] Mrs Thrale for example, appear in society wearing a polynesian-inspired dress.[10] Richard's presence, or lack thereof, as part of the colonial project in India, coupled with James Burney's dealings with the East India Company is yet another problem. It is certain that the spectre of India in the Burney family is inextricable from any discussion of their precarity. But since Burney describes British national identity in antagonistic terms, as a colonial project as present in England as India and the West Indies, the extent to which she critiqued empire at the same time she discussed the material culture of Britishness remains an open question.

Perhaps a more difficult omission is that of Mrs Meeke. We have already seen how the Meeke family's link to the Jacobites complicated their rehabilitation. This only underscores the extent to which it remains difficult to talk of Jacobite or loyalist families, of English or European families, and how this complicates discrete national identities. But it also suggests, as Charles' own reliance on these networks demonstrates, how these links both sustained and threatened the Burneys' social standing. Mrs Meeke was one of the most prolific 18th century novelists, publishing over 30 books with the Minerva Press. She therefore stands in contrast with her stepsister, whose anxieties over publication were rooted in the fear dilution in exposure to the marketplace and moral opprobrium. Meeke's husband Samuel was 'under the auspices of Madame de Genlis', an English language teacher in Paris with links to the Jacobins.[11] Frances meanwhile had met de Genlis in 1785. Only later - having realised the impropriety of the connection after pressure from her father - was she forced to take advice from Queen Charlotte on how to break the connection.[12] Elizabeth Allen must therefore be a constant mirror image to her stepsister. Charles, so afraid of any contamination of the Burney family, must have worried incessantly about the prospect of her return. Here was a family member who rejected the bourgeois norms with which Burney sought to engage and embraced the anarchy of the marketplace, no matter the risk of being seen to prostitute onself. Like Madame Duval, she was the awkward relative who both promised and threatened

[9] Claire Harman, *Frances Burney: A Biography* (London: Flamingo, 2000), 78.
[10] Margaret Anne Doody, *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1988), 104.
[11] Simon Macdonald, 'Identifying Mrs Meeke: Another Burney Family Novelist' *The Review of English Studies,* New Series, Vol. 64, No. 265 (JUNE 2013), 367-385, 380.
[12] Magdi Wahba, 'Madame de Genlis in England' *Comparative Literature,* Vol. 13, No. 3 (Summer, 1961), 221-238 , 226-7.

another life of danger and excitement on the continent. A further comparison between Frances and Bessie, not to mention Frances and Richard, would further illuminate how religion, empire, and the marketplace shaped the limits of the acceptable family in the eighteenth century. But it would also further demonstrate one of the central claims of this thesis: that private and public identity were often in direct contrast and conflict, and that the reception of British national identity was part of a much wider historical and religious reckoning in family life.

A further question raised by this thesis is that of Frances' wider political philosophy. We have seen her engagement with Hume and Smith. Though her father's library lacked fiction, she read Cicero, Voltaire, Pliny, Thucydides, Dante, and Petrarch in French and Italian alongside Moore's *Fable for the Female Sex*, Fordyce's *Sermons to Young Women*, and Elizabeth Rowe's *Letters Moral and Entertaining.*[13] History, poetry, philosophy, and political theory were the context against which she read conduct literature. But key too was her clear admiration of Fenelon, whom she read as a child and whom she ensured her Franco-British child would read. As Anna Battagelli points out, Fenelon's well-known work Telemachus does not only 'school his conscience in the kingly virtues' of stoicism, but also intervenes in defence of the doctrine of quietism.[14] Quietism defended deference not to kingly and papal authority, but to the believer's conscience. This appeal - part of a wider debate in the post-reformation catholic church - was particularly appealing to English Catholics. Jacobites too found much to like in Telemachus' quest to find and restore his father.[15] Fenelon's insistence on common humanity and attack on Bourbon absolutism and materialism helped defend Catholics from accusations that their faith was intrinsically authoritarian.

Indeed, Burney was clearly well aware about the existence of these debates in contemporary Catholicism. Her own defence of the shared identity of English Protestants and Catholics reflects that of the Catholic radical dramatist Elizabeth Inchbald. The Burney family certainly

[13] Kate Chisholm, *Fanny Burney: Her Life* (London: Vintage, 1998), 19.
[14] Anna Battagelli, 'Fenelonian Reform, Catholic Jacobites, and Jane Barkers Enlightenment Dramas of Conscience,' in Ulrich Lehner, ed *Women, Enlightenment, and Catholicism* (London: Routledge, 2018), 202 - 215, 202-4, 208
[15] Battagelli, 204. One might argue that eighteenth-century plots of restoration - which drive Evelina in particular - are tacit engagements with the possibility of return to Stuart order.

knew of Inchbald - Charles Burney had penned a short poem in defence of her talent. [16]A dramatist, novelist, and Catholic, Inchbald defined categorisation, able as Tomkin suggests, 'to journey imaginatively philosophically and socially amid many contrasting worlds'[17] Inchbald's *A Simple Story* points, much like Burney's fiction, to the sociability of English Catholic life, arguing akin to Charlotte Lennox's *Female Quixote* that propaganda and novels only hinders the reality of tolerance by leading the reader to gloss proof of Catholic suffering as proof of Catholic tyranny. This then suggests not only the difficulties of categorisation, but also places Burney in a distinctly Catholic and European intellectual conversation. An understandable tendency to categorise hard and fast distinction between confessions, families, and identities is therefore shown to hinder our understanding of how identities were contextual in the eighteenth century.

Perhaps the best evidence of Burney's awareness of Catholic enlightenment thought however is her time among the Juniper Hall set. Alexandre d'Arblay's milieu were inextricable from the constitutionalist movement in the early days of the Revolution. Madame de Stael's reputation thus may have driven Charles fear of his daughter's associates, but it was Frances' acquaintance with the group whom he and a larger section of England blamed for the revolution that seems to have been a more pressing source of his distrust. de Stael and Talleyrand (with whom d'Arblay was particularly close) were at the forefront of the intellectual efforts to weaken French Absolutism and bring in a 1688 influenced constitution.[18] Burney was enchanted by Juniper Hall set. Despite the supposed isolation of her years in France which was claimed by her Victorian critics, it makes no sense to suggest that *The Wanderer*, written after a decade in Paris and marriage to one of that set, contained no links to the ideas of that milieu. Yet this does not mean, as the final chapter demonstrated, that she was wholly sympathetic. The legacy of 1688 set off a century of uncertainty, the disruption of the great chain of being engendering existential risk for women and risked splitting family against family in the manner of the Civil Wars of the 17th century.

[16] Charles Burney to Mrs Crewe, 3 Mar 1802, MS Hyde 88, Houghton Library.
[17] Michael Tomko, 'Between Revolutionary Jacobins and English Catholic Cisalpines: The Roles of Elizabeth Inchbald (1751-3 - 1821) in the age of Enlightenment', in Ulrich Lehner, ed. *Women, Enlightenment, and Catholicism* (London: Routledge, 2018), 189 - 201, 191.
[18] Biancamaria Fontana, *Germaine de Stael: A Political Portrait* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2016), 21, 47-50, 94-100.

Burney's scepticism of Humean and Smithian sociability is therefore worth contrasting with the enlightenment philosophy she read from her father's library. Burney is clearly sceptical of the aptness of social contract theory. So too does her fear of the ever-present capacity for mass violence and description of George III's attempts to sublimate this violence by embodying polite society perhaps reflect a version of Hobbes. Although no evidence exists that she read Hobbes, an author whose works were rare in the 18th century, it is plausible nevertheless that she was aware of his arguments. Her own logic intertwines with his; that granting the sovereign the power to wage war, granting that monopoly of violence was the only way in which to avoid constant social violence. Hobbes' awkward straddling of Republicanism and Royalism indeed straddles her own Stuart and Hanoverian sympathies. Her rejection of the social benefits of luxury as she points to the role of material culture and consumption in nation building moreover rejects the economic doctrines of a much wider historical tradition. Yet Burney is not so easily categorised. Fearing both republicanism and absolutism, she remains as eager to point to the multiplicity of identities, histories and ways of seeing within national borders as she is terrified at the resurgence of violence.

Towards the end of her life Burney sought to fashion a coherent identity for posterity. Her rewriting of her father's biography remains particularly revealing, seeking to stabilise what was always a marginalised and precarious identity, it created stability and coherency where little existed. Charles was not, as Mrs Piozzi never tired of hinting, well liked. Indeed, our attempts to distinguish Frances' creation of her father against what remains of his life is difficult precisely because we do not know what, exactly, she suppressed beyond a few details. Nevertheless, Frances' attempts to fashion for her family a coherent identity through literary biography, and careful curation of her own letters, points to the link between writing, body, and self-fashioning identified by the second generation of Burney scholars in the 80s. In turn, this points to the necessity of involving novels and romances as source materials in histories of nationality. Similarly Burney's anxiety about being sold and read points to Adam Smith's sociable marketplace and the dangers of attempting to self-fashion. In other words, if writing was self-fashioning, the text inextricable from the body, then selling one's writing did not just carry the psychological risks found in her novels, but also came dangerously close to prostitution. As Cecilia and Camilla discover, being a woman is to be always at the mercy of structural forces, and one must find refuge where one can.

Burney's rejection of 'novels' and genre in her writing is therefore inextricable from her rejection of the grand historical narratives of progress which obsessed her contemporaries. Burney's unsettled names and plots with lukewarm endings reflect her Humean scepticism of whiggish histories of liberty or progress. Indeed, Burney's unsettled names, broken families, and orphaned heroines only further reflect the poverty of genre and of plot. Neat plots therefore risk repeating the same errors of history. Her ultimate failure to fit her heroines within these structures and the psychological trauma they suffer from the attempts, only underscore how genre was inseparable from the hegemonic work of history in the eighteenth century. The neat family, just like the neat subject was, as Burney repeatedly argued, a violent creation. One which left orphaned branches and dead wood. If Smith is as crucial as Hume as Burney implies, then the work of the literary and social or economic historian must be interdisciplinary. Any reliance on text risks repeating Hanoverian propaganda and smoothing over the bloody work of building nation and empire.

Bibliography

Primary manuscript sources.

Egerton and Additional Manuscripts, British Library.

MS Hyde, Houghton Library, Harvard University.

Fulham and John Moore Papers, Lambeth Palace Library.

MSS d'Arblay, New York Public Library.

Primary printed sources.

Addison, Joseph, & Steele, Richard, *The Spectator: A New Edition.* ed. Henry Morley (London: George Routledge and Sons. [1891]).

Andrews, John, *Remarks on the French and English Ladies: in a Series of Letters* (London: T. Longman, 1783).

Anon, *An Appeal from the Protestant Association to the People of Great Britain* (London: J.W Pasham, 1779).

Astell, Mary, *Political Writings,* Patricia Springboard ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Austen, *Northanger Abbey* ed. Claire Grogan (Peterborough: Broadview, 1996)

Austen, J. *Northanger Abbey* ed. Marilyn Butler (London: Penguin, 2003).

Barbauld, Anna Laetitia, *Sins of Government, Sins of the Nation, &c* (London: Printed for J. Johnson, 1793).

Barrett, Charlotte ed., *The Diary and letters of Madame d'Arblay, author of Evelina, Cecilia, &c, edited by her niece,* Vol. II, 1781 – 1786, (London: Henry Colburn, 1842).

Berington, Simon, *A Modest Enquiry How far Catholicks are Guilty of the Horrid Tennets…* (London, 1749).

- Memoires de Gaudence de Lucques (1777)

Blackstone, William, *Commentaries on the Laws of England, in Four Books* (London: T. Cadell, 1794

Britannicus, *A Series of Letters Addressed to a Friend, upon the Roman Catholic Question* (London: F.C and J. Rivington, 1820)

Burney, Charles [1726 – 1814] *The Letters of Charles Burney,* Vol 1, 1751 – 1784, Ed by Alvaro Ribeiro, SJ (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991)

- *The Present State of Music in France and Italy: Or, the Journal of a Tour Through Those countries, undertaken to collect materials for a general history of music,* (London: T. Becket and co on the strand, 1771)

Burney, Charles [1757 – 1817] *On the Threatened Invasion* [Deptford Bridge: J Delahoy, 1803] [With MS corrections by the author]

Burney, Frances, *Additional Journals and Letters of Frances Burney,* Stewart Cooke and Peter Sabor, eds., 2 Vols, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2015-18).

Brief Reflections relative to the emigrant French Clergy, Earnestly submitted to the humane consideration of the Ladies of Great Britain, (London: Thomas Cadell, 1793)

- *Camilla,* eds. *Edward A. Bloom and Lillian D. Bloom* (Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 2009)
- *Cecilia,* eds. Peter Sabor and Margaret Anne Doody (Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 2008)
- *Complete Plays of Frances Burney,* ed by Peter Sabor, 2 vols. (London: William Pickering, 1995)
- *Diaries and Letters of Madame d'Arblay (Frances Burney)* with notes by W.C Ward and prefaced by Lord Macauley's essay, in 3 vols. Vol 1 (1778 – 1787), (London: Vizetelly and Co, 1890).

- *Early Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney*, Stewart Cooke, et al., ed. 5 Vols. (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1988 – 2012).
- *Evelina* (Oxford: Oxford Worlds Classics, 2008)
- *Journals and Letters* ed. Peter Sabor and Lars Troide (London: Penguin, 2001).
- *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay),* ed. Joyce Hemlow et al., 12 Vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972 – 1984).
- *Memoirs of Dr Burney* (Philadelphia: Key and Biddle, 1833)
- *The Wanderer* eds. Margaret Anne Doody, Robert L Mack, and Peter Sabor, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991)

Bush, Thomas, *Popery Dissected* (Boston: J. Derby, 1819)

Butler, Charles, *An Address to the Protestants of Great Britain and Ireland*, Second edition, with additions (London: Hansard, 1813)

- *The Philological and Biographical works of Charles Butler, esquire, of Lincoln's Inn, in five volumes: Volume V: Containing Church of France* (London: Printed for W. Clarke and Sons, Portugal Street, Lincoln's Inn, 1817).

Challoner, Richard, *A Memorial of Ancient British Piety: or, a British Martyrology* (London: W. Needham, 1761).

Chapone, Hester, *Letters on the Improvement of the Mind* (Dublin: J. Exshaw, esq, 1773).

Croker, John Wilson, 'D'Arblay's Wanderer' in *The Quarterly Review, April and July 1814. Vol. XI* (London: John Murray, 1814), 123-30.

d'Arblay, Alexander Charles Louis, *Funeral Sermon, Preached in Camden Chapel, St Pancras, on Sunday July XVIII, MDCCCXXX, on the occasion of his majesty, George the Fourth* (London: Gilbert and Rivington, 1830)

An Apostolic Gift of Tongues: *Contrasted with Some Modern Claims to Inspiration: A Sermon, Preached in Camden Chapel, St Pancras, on January 8, 1832, preceded by an introductory discourse on the prevailing spirit of the times, and its effects on national religion / To which is added an appendix, containing an answer to Hume on miracles, and to Laplace on atheistical necessity* (London, 1832)

Evans, William David, *A Collection of Statutes Connected with the General Administration of the Law,* Vol. 5 (London: Saunders and Benning, 1829),

Geddes, Alexander, *A Modest Apology for the Roman Catholics*, (London: 1800).

Grose, Frances, *A Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue* (London: S Hooper, 1788).

Hazlitt, William, 'Standard Novels and Romances,' *Edinburgh Review* xxiv (Feb. 1815), 320 – 338.

- *Lectures On the English Poets,* (New York: Wiley Putnam, 1845).

Higden, William, *A View of the English Constitution,* 3rd ed, (London: Printed for S. Keble at the Turks-head, and R. Gossing at the Mitre in Fleet street, 1710 [1690])

Hill, Constance, *Juniper Hall* (London & New York: John Lane, 1904).

Hume, David, *Political Essays*, Knud Haakonssen, ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 82.

- *The Theory of Moral Sentiments,* (London: Penguin, 2009)
- *The Wealth of Nations, Books I – III,* edited with introduction and notes by Adrian Skinner, (London: Penguin, 1999)

Inchbald, Elizabeth, *A Simple Story*, ed. J.M.S Tompkins (Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 2008)

- *Nature and Art*, ed. Shawn Lisa Maurer (Peterborough: Broadview, 2005)

Leslie, Charles, *The Constitution, Laws and Government of England Vindicated* (London: 1709).

Lewis, Matthew, *The Monk,* ed. Howard Anderson (Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 2008).

More, Hannah, *Essays on Various Subjects, Principally Designed for Young Ladies,* 5th ed. (London: T. Cadell, 1791).

- *Sacred Dramas chiefly intended for young persons: the subjects taken from the bible. To which is added, SENSIBILITY, A POEM,* (Dublin: P. Byrne, 1784).

Murphy, Arthur, *The Life of David Garrick* (London, 1801) [Rev CB MS notes.]

Piozzi, Hester Lynch, *Observations and Reflections Made in the Course of a Journey through France, Italy, and Germany, in two vols.* (London: T. Cadell, 1789).

Pitt, William, *The Speech of the right honourable William Pitt, on Tuesday the second of March 1790* (London: C. Stuart, 1790)

Playstowe, Philip, *The Gentleman's Guide in His Tour Through France, Wrote by an Officer* (London: G Kearsley, 1768)

Pope, Alexander, *The Major Works* ed. Pat Rogers (Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 2008)

Plowden, Robert, *A letter to Francis Plowden […] on his work, entitled Jura Anglorum,* (London: J.P Coghlan, 1794)

Radcliffe, Anne, *The Mysteries of Udolpho,* ed. Bonamy Dobrée (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

The Rambler: A Catholic Journal and Review, New Series: Vol. 5, (London: Burns and Lambert, 1856).

Reeve, Clara, *The Old English Baron* (Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 2008).

Smith, Adam, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments (London: Penguin, 2009).*

- *The Wealth of Nations, Books I – III, edited with introduction and notes by Adrian Skinner, (London: Penguin, 1999)*

Wake, W.R., *Two Sermons Preached in the Paris Church of St Michael* (Bath: W.Gye, 1793)

Wollstonecraft, Mary, *A Vindication of the Wrongs of Women and A Vindication of the Rights of Man,* ed. Janet Todd (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Wright, C., *The History and Description of Arundel Castle* (London: 1818).

Wyvill, Christopher, *A Letter to the Right Honourable William Pitt* (York: W. Blanchard, 1793)

Secondary sources.

Agamben, Giorgio, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).

Altick, Richard Daniel, *The Shows of London* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1978).

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 2006).

Andrews, Robert M., "Women of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century High Church Tradition: A Biographical and Historiographical Exploration of a Forgotten Phenomenon in Anglican History", *Anglican and Episcopal History*, Vol. 84, No. 1 (March 2015), 49-64

Arendt, Hannah, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (London: Penguin, 2017).

Aston, Nigel, *Art and Religion in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (London: Reaktion Books, 2009).

- '"The Limits of Latitudinarianism" English Reactions to Bishop Clayton's An Essay On Spirit."' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 49, no3, 3 July 1998, 407-433.

Aston, Nigel, ed. *Religious Change in Europe, 1650 – 1914: Essays for John McManners* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1997).

Aveling, J.C.H., *The Handle and the Ax: The Catholic Recusants in England from Reformation to Emancipation* (London: Blond & Briggs Ltd, 1976).

Baker, Malcolm, '"For Pembroke Statues, Dirty Gods and Coins" : The Collecting, Display, and Uses of Sculpture at Wilton House', *Studies in the History of Art*, Vol. 70, Symposium Papers XLVII: Collecting Sculpture in Early Modern Europe (2008), 378-395

Banks, Bryan A., and Erica Johnson, eds. *The French Revolution and Religion in Global perspective: Freedom and Faith* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillain, 2017).

Barchas, Janine, *Matters of Fact in Jane Austen: History, Location, and Celebrity* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012)

Barry, Helen, 'Rethinking Politeness in Eighteenth-Century England: Moll King's Coffee House and the Significance of "Flash" Talk,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Vol 11, (2001), 65-81.

- The Pleasures of Austerity, *JECS*, 37:2 (2014). 261 – 277.

Batchelor, Jennie, *Dress, Distress, and Desire: Clothing and the Female Body in Eighteenth-Century Literature* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

Bayly, C. A., *The Birth of the Modern World: 1780 - 1914* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004).

Bell, David A., *The Cult of the Nation in France, Inventing Nationalism 1680 – 1800* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).

Bessel, Richard, Nicholas Guyatt, and Jane Rendall, eds. *War, Empire, and Slavery*, 1770 – 1830 (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010).

Bellaigue, Geoffrey de, 'Huzza the King is well!' *The Burlington Magazine,* Vol. 126, No. 985 (June 1984), 325 – 331.

Bence-Jones, Mark, *The Catholic Families* (London: Constable, 1992).

Black, Jeremy, *George III: America's Last King* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006, 2008).

Bossy, John, *The English Catholic Community 1570 – 1850.* (London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1975).

Bourdieu, Pierre, *Outline of a Theory of Practice,* trans. Richard Price, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).

Bourke, Richard, *Empire and Revolution: The Political Life of Edmund Burke* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2015).

Bracey, Robert, 'Mrs Fitzherbert,' *Blackfriars,* Vol. 20, No. 237 (December 1939), 855-860.

Bradley, James E., *Religion, Revolution, and English Radicalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

Brewer, John, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Harper Collins, 1997).

Brofsky, Howard, 'Doctor Burney and Padre Martini: Writing a General History of Music', *The Musical Quarterly,* Vol. 65, No. 3 (Jul., 1979), 313-345

Brubaker, Rogers, *Ethnicity Without Groups* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004).

- "Ethnicity Without Groups", *European Journal of Sociology / Archives Européennes de Sociologie / Europäisches Archiv für Soziologie,* Vol. 43, No. 2, Études critiques (2002), 163-189.

Bullion, John L., ‘The Prince's Mentor: A New Perspective on the Friendship between George III and Lord Bute during the 1750s’, *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies,* Vol. 21, No. 1 (Spring, 1989) 35-54.

Burgess, Miranda J., *British Fiction and the Production of Social Order, 1740 – 1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Burton, June J., *Napoleon and the Woman Question: Discourses of the Other Sex in French Education, Medicine, and Medical Law* (Lubbock. TX: Texas Tech University Press, 2007).

Callaghan, William James, and David Higgs, eds., *Church and Society in Catholic Europe of the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

Campbell Orr, Clarissa, ed., *Queenship in Britain, 1660 – 1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics,* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003).

Carpenter, Kirsty, *Refugees of the French Revolution: Emigres in London, 1789 – 1802* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999).

Carpenter, Kirsty and Philip Mansel, eds, *The French Émigrés in Europe and the Struggle against Revolution, 1789 – 1814* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999).

Carr, E. H., *What Is History?* (London: Penguin, 1990).

Castle, Terry, *Masquerade and Civilisation* (London: Methuen, 1986).

Chalus, Elaine, and Perry Gauchi, eds., *Revisiting the Polite and Commercial People: Essays in Honour of Paul Langford* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).

Champion, Justin, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies 1660–1730* (Cambridge, 1992).

Chinnici, Joseph P., *The English Catholic Enlightenment: John Lingard and the Cisalpine Movement, 1780 – 1850* (Shepherdstown: The Patmos Press, 1980).

Chisholm, Kate, *Fanny Burney: Her Life* (London: Vintage, 1999).

Civale, Susan, 'The Literary Afterlife of Frances Burney and the Victorian Periodical Press,' *Victorian Periodicals Review*, Vol 44, No. 3, (Fall 2011), 236 – 266.

Clark, Emily and Mary Laven (eds.), *Women and Religion in the Atlantic Age, 1550 – 1900* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013).

Clark, J.C.D., *English Society 1688 – 1832* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

- *From Restoration to Reform: The British Isles 1660 – 1832* (London: Vintage, 2014).

Clark, Lorna J., 'Frances Burney's Methods of Narrating the Court Experience' *Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies,* Vol. 40. No. 2. (2017), 223 – 235.

- Ed, *A Celebration of Frances Burney* (Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007).

Claydon, Tony, *Europe and the Making of England, 1660 – 1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Claydon, Tony, and Ian Mcbride (eds.), *Protestantism and National Identity*: *Britain and Ireland, c1650 – 1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Clayton, Timothy, 'Strange, Sir Robert (1721 – 1792), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, version: 17 September 2015, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/26638.

Colley, Linda, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707 – 1837* (London: Vintage, 1992),

- ‘The Apotheosis of George III: Loyalty, Royalty and the British Nation 1760 – 1820. *Past and Present,* No. 102 (Feb. 1984), 94 – 129.

Collini, Stefan, Richard Watmore, and Brian Young (eds), *History, Religion, and Culture: British Intellectual History 1750 – 1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Cooke, Stewart, Frances Burney and the ‘Cantabs’, *ECL*, Vol.42 No.2, (2018), 94-111.

Copeland, Edward, ‘Money in the Novels of Fanny Burney,’ *Studies in the Novel,* Vol. 8, No. 1 (spring 1976), 24-37.

Copley, Stephen, and Peter Garside, eds., *The Politics of the Picturesque: Literature, Landscape, and Aesthetics since 1770* (Cambridge: Cambridge university press, 1994).

Cornwall, Robert D., & William Gibson, eds., *Religion Politics and Dissent 1660 – 1832: Essays in honour of James E Bradley* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010).

Coulombeau, Sophie, ‘Burney Family Tree’, *Eighteenth-Century Life*, Vol.42, No.2 (2018),12-13.

Craft-Fairchild, Catherine, *Masquerade and Gender: Disguise and Female Identity in Eighteenth Century Fictions by Women* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993).

Cunningham, Vanessa, *Shakespeare and Garrick* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008

Cutting-Grey, Joanne, *Woman as ‘Nobody’ and the Novels of Fanny Burney* (Gainsville: University of Florida Press, 1992).

- ‘Writing Innocence: Fanny Burney’s Evelina’ *Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature* Vol. 9. No. 1, Women Writing Autobiography, (Spring, 1990), 43-57.

Daunton, M. J., *Progress and Poverty: An Economic and Social History of Britain 1730 – 1850* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)

Davenport, Hester, *Faithful Handmaid: Fanny Burney at the Court of King George III* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2000).

Davies, Colin, 'Etat Present: Hauntology, Presence, and Spectres' *French Studies*, Vol. LIX, No. 3, 373–379.

Derrida, Jacques, *Spectres of Marx* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006).

Dinwiddy, J.R., "Charles James Fox as Historian." *The Historical Journal*, Vol.12, No. 1 (1969): 23–34

- *Radicalism and Reform in Britain, 1780 – 1850* (London and Rio Grande, The Hambledon Press, 1992).

Doody, Margaret Anne., *Frances Burney*: *The Life in the Works* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1988).

Duffy, Eamon, ed., *Challoner and His Church: A Catholic Bishop in Georgian England* (London: Darnton, Longman, and Todd, 1981).

- *Joseph Berington and the English Catholic Cisalpine Movement, 1772–1803* (unpublished PhD thesis, Cambridge University, 1973).

Eger, Elizabeth, *Bluestockings: Women of Reason from Enlightenment to Romanticism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

Elton, G. R. ed., *The New Cambridge Modern History*. 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

Epstein, James A., *Radical Expression: Political Language, Ritual, and Symbol in England, 1790 – 1850* (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

Epstein, Julia. *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing* (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1989).

Erickson, A. L., 'Coverture and Capitalism' *History Workshop Journal*, No. 59 (Spring, 2005), 1-16.

- *Women and Property in Early Modern England* (London: Routledge, 1993).

Fahrmeir, Andreas, *Citizenship: The Rise and Fall of A Modern Concept* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007).

Farr, Jason S., 'Sharp Minds / Twisted Bodies: Intellect, Disability, and Female Education in Frances Burney's "Camilla"', *The Eighteenth Century*, Vol. 55, No. 1 (Spring 2014), 1 – 17.

Farrell, S.M., "Herbert, George Augustus, Eleventh Earl of Pembroke and Eighth Earl of Montgomery (1759–1827), Army Officer and Landowner." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* 2009. [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-13026.]

Fick, Carolyn, 'Revolutionary Saint Domingue and the Emerging Atlantic: Paradigms of Sovereignty' *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* Vol. 31, No. 2, The Second Slavery: Mass Slavery, World-Economy, and Comparative Microhistories, Part I (2008), 121-144.

Fisher, Mark 'What is Hauntology?' *Film Quarterly* Vol. 66, No. 1 (Fall 2012), 16-24.

Fontana, Biancamaria, *Germaine de Stael: A Political Portrait* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2016)

Foreman, Amanda, *Georgiana: Duchess of Devonshire* (London: Flamingo, 1999).

Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan, (London: Penguin, 1977).

Franklin, Caroline ‘A Land of Slavery and Superstition’? Hester Thrale and Elizabeth Montagu in France’, *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 114, No. 2 (April 2019), 212-229.

Fraser, Flora, *Princesses: The Six Daughters of George III* (London: John Fraser, 2005).

Fung, Julian, ‘Frances Burney as Satirist’, *The Modern Language Review,* Vol. 106, No. 4 (October 2011), 937 – 953.

Gallagher, Catherine, *Nobody's Story: The Vanishing Acts of Women Writers in the Marketplace,* 1670 – 1820, (Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995).

Ganz, Melissa J., ‘Clandestine Schemes: Burney’s Cecilia and the Marriage Act’ *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation,* Vol 54, No. 1(Spring 2013): 25 – 51.

Geogehan, Patrick M., ‘The Catholics and the Union’ *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, sixth series, Vol x (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 243 – 258.

Ghoshal Walsh, Tara, ‘Rewriting Radicalism: Wollstonecraft in Burney’s The Wanderer’, *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* Vol. 24, No. 3 (Spring 2012), 487 – 508.

Gibson, William, and Ingram, R.G., *Religious Identities in Britain, 1660 – 1832* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005).

Girard, Phillippe R., ‘Black Talleyrand: Toussaint Louverture's Diplomacy, 1798-1802’ *The William and Mary Quarterly,* Third Series, Vol. 66, No. 1 (Jan., 2009), 87-124.

Girard, René, *Violence and the Sacred,* trans: Patrick Gregory, (London: Bloomsbury Revelations, 2013).

Gleadle, Kathryn, and Sarah Richardson, (eds.), *Women in British Politics, 1760 – 1860: The Power of the Petticoat* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000).

Glickman, Gabriel, *The English Catholic Community, 1688 – 1745* (London: Boydell and Brewer, 2009).

Goodden, Angelica, *Madame de Stael: The Dangerous Exile* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Gores, Steven J., *Psychosocial Spaces: Verbal and Visual Readings of British Culture, 1750 – 1820* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2000).

O'Gorman, Frank, *The Long Eighteenth-Century: British Political and Social History 1688-1832* (London: Hodder, 1997).

Greenblatt, Stephen, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

Grenby, M. O., *Anti-Jacobin Novel: British Conservatism and the French Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Grenfall, Michael, ed., *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (New York: Routledge, 2012).

Grunner, Elizabeth Rose, 'The Bullfinch and the Brother: Marriage and Family in Frances Burney's "Camilla", *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology,* Vol. 93, No. 1, (Jan. 1994), 18-34.

Guyatt, Nicholas, *Bind Us Apart: How Enlightened Americans Invented Racial Segregation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

Hadlow, Janice, *The Strangest Family: The Private Lives of George III, Queen Charlotte, and the Hanoverians* (London: William Collins, 2014).

Hague, William. *William Pitt the Younger* (London: Harper Perennial, 2005).

Harman, Claire, *Fanny Burney* (London: Flamingo, 2001).

Harris, James A., *Hume: An Intellectual Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

Harris, Jocelyn, *Satire, Celebrity, and Politics in Jane Austen* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2017).

Harsanyi, Doina Pasca, *Lessons from America: Liberal French Nobles in Exile, 1793-1798* (State Park, PA: Pennsylvania University Press, 2010).

Harting, Johanna, *Catholic London Missions* (London: Sand & Co, 1903).

Harvey, Karen, *The Little Republic: Masculinity and Domestic Authority in Eighteenth Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Hastings, Adrian, *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion, and Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Hatton, Ragnhild, *George I* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001).

Haydon, Colin., *Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth-Century England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993).

- 'The Gordon Riots in the English provinces', *Historical Research*, Vol.63, Issue 152 (October 1990), 354-359

Haynes, Clare, 'Of Her Making: The Cultural Practice of Mary, 9th Duchess of Norfolk', *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*, Vol. 31, No. 1/2, Eighteenth-Century Women And English Catholicism (Spring/Fall 2012), 77-98.

Haywood, Ian, and John Seed, eds., *The Gordon Riots: Politics, Culture, and Insurrection in Late Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

Hemlow, Joyce, 'Fanny Burney and the Courtesy Books,' *PMLA*, Vol 65, No. 5 (Sep., 1950), 732 – 761.

- *The History of Fanny Burney*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958).

Hicks, Philip, 'The Roman Matron in Britain: Female Political Influence and Republican Response, ca. 1750–1800' *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 77, No. 1 (March 2005),

Hitchcock, Tim and Cohen, Michele, eds. *English Masculinities, 1660 – 1800,* (Harlow: Addison, Wesley, Longman, 1999).

Hitchen, Neil W., 'The politics of English Bible Translation in Georgian England: the Alexander Prize essay' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* sixth series, volume ix. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 67 – 92.

Hobsbawm, Eric, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

Hoeveler, Diane Long, *The Gothic Ideology: Religious Hysteria and Anti-Catholicism in British Popular Fiction, 1780 – 1880* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2014).

Hole, Robert, *Pulpits, Politics, and Public Order in England: 1760 – 1832,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

Hoock, Holger, *Empires of the Imagination* (London: Profile, 2010).

Hopkinson, Martin, 'Sir Robert Strange*', Print Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (December 2008), 408-423.

Hunt, Tamara L., *Defining John Bull: Political Caricature and National Identity in Late-Georgian England* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017).

Hunter, J. Paul, *Before Novels: The Cultural Contexts of Eighteenth-Century English Fiction* (New York & London: W.W. Norton, 1990).

Israel, Jonathan, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650 – 1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Jacobs, W. M., *The Clerical Profession in the Long Eighteenth Century 1680 - 1840* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007),

James, C.L.R., *The Black Jacobins* (London: Penguin, 1938, 2001).

Janowitz, Anne, *England's Ruins: Poetic Purpose and the National Landscape* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990).

Jasanoff, Maya, *Liberty's Exiles: The Loss of America and the Remaking of the British Empire*, (London: Harper, 2011).

Kaplan, Benjamin J., *Divided by Faith: Religious conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007).

Kavanagh, Declan, *Effeminate Years: Literature, Politics, and Aesthetics in mid Eighteenth Century Britain* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2017).

Kelly, Gary, *The English Jacobin Novel 1780-1805* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976).

Keohane, Catherine, '"Too Neat for a Beggar": Charity and Debt in Burney's Cecilia' *Studies in the Novel*, Vol. 33, No. 4 (Winter 2001), 379-401.

Kerber, Linda K., 'Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History', *The Journal of American History* Vol. 75, No. 1 (Jun., 1988), 9-39.

Kevin Jordan, J., *Revisiting Stonehenge: Marriage, Masculinity, And Burney's Sentimental Hero In The Wanderer* [Unpublished MA thesis], University of Florida, 2003.

Klein, Lawrence E., 'Politeness and the Interpretation of the British Eighteenth Century,' *The Historical Journal* Vol 45. No. 4 (December 2002), 869 – 898.

Klein, Lawrence E. and Anthony J. LaVopa, (Eds.), *Enthusiasm and Enlightenment in Europe, 1650 – 1850),* (San Marino: Henry E. Huntington Library, 1998).

Kortes-Papp, Victoria, 'Madness as Shelter for Feminist Ideas: Elinor's Role in Frances Burney's The Wanderer.' *Lumen*, Vol. 18, (1999) 95–106,

Kristeva, Julia, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, trans: Leon S. Roudiez, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982).

Langford, Paul *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character 1650 - 1850* (Oxford: OUP, 2000).

Laqueur, Thomas, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990).

Lawday, David, *Napoleons's Master: A Life of Prince Talleyrand* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2006

LeCain, Timothy, *The Matter of History: How Things Create the Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

Lees, J.C., 'The Religious Retinue of Leicester House: Chaplains of Frederick Louis, Prince of Wales,1729 - 51', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol.40 No.1 (2017), 89 – 109.

Lehner, Ulrich, *The Catholic Enlightenment: The Forgotten History of a Global Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

- (ed) *Women, Enlightenment, and Catholicism* (London: Routledge, 2018).

Lemmings, David, *Law and Government in England during the Long Eighteenth Century*: *From Consent to Command* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

Lewis, Judith, *Sacred to Female Patriotism: Gender, Class, and Politics in Late Georgian Britain* (New York and London: Routledge, 2003)

Lipsedge, Karen, *Domestic Space in Eighteenth-Century British Novels* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012).

Lock, Alexander, 'Catholicism, Apostasy and Politics in late Eighteenth-Century England: The Case of Sir Thomas Gascoigne and Charles Howard, Earl of Surrey' *Recusant History*, Vol. 30 No.2, 275–298.

Lonsdale, Roger, *Dr Charles Burney: A Literary Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).

Lukowski, Jerzy, *The European Nobility in the Eighteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

Macdonald, Simon, 'Identifying Mrs Meeke: Another Burney Family Novelist' *The Review of English Studies*, Vol.64 (2013), 367 – 385.

Mahiet, Damien, Charles Burney; or, the Philosophical Misfortune of a Liberal Musician', *Eighteenth-Century Music* Vol.10 No.1 (2013), 41–63.

Major, Emma, *Madam Britannia: Women, Church, and Nation, 1712 – 1812* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

- 'Femininity and National Identity: Elizabeth Montagu's trip to France', *ELH*, Volume 72, Number 4, (Winter 2005), 901-918.

Mandler, Peter, 'What is "National Identity"? Definitions and Applications in Modern British Historiography' *Modern Intellectual History*, Vol.3 No.2 (2006), 271–297.

Manvell, Roger, *Elizabeth Inchbald: A Biographical Study* (London: University Press of America, 1987).

Marshall, Bridget, *The Transatlantic Gothic Novel and the Law, 1790 – 1860* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

Marshall, Peter, *The Impeachment of Warren Hastings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965).

Marshall, Peter, & Geoffrey Scott (eds.), *Catholic Gentry in English Society* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

Maunu, Leanne, *Women Writing the Nation: National Identity, Female Community, and the British-French connection, 1770 – 1820* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2007).

Mawl, Timothy, *Horace Walpole: The Great Outsider* (London: John Murray, 1996).

McCormack, Matthew, *The Independent Man: Citizenship and Gender Politics in Georgian England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005).

McCrea, Brian. *Frances Burney and Narrative Prior to Ideology* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013).

McInnes, A., German, K., and Graham, L. (Eds.) *Living with Jacobitism, 1690 – 1788* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2014).

McMaster, Juliet, *Reading the Body in the Eighteenth-Century Novel* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004).

McNeill, J. R., 'Yellow Jack and Geopolitics: Environment, Epidemics, and the Struggles for Empire in the American Tropics, 1640-1830' *Review (Fernand Braudel Center),* Vol. 27, No. 4, The Environment and World History (2004), 343-364.

Mctague, John, Anti-Catholicism, Incorrigibility and Credulity in the Warming-Pan Scandal of 1688-9', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* Vol. 36 No. 3 (2013), 433 – 448.

Mitchell, Sebastian, *Visions of Britain, 1730 – 1830: Anglo Scottish Writing and Representation* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

Moores, John Richard, *Representations of France in English Satirical Prints, 1740 – 1832* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).

Morieux, Renaud, *The Channel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

Moretti, Franco, *The Bourgeois: Between History and Literature* (London: Verso, 2014).

Mowl, Timothy, *Horace Walpole: The Great Outsider* (London: John Murray,1996).

Müller, Patrick. *Latitudinarianism and Didacticism in Eighteenth-Century Literature*: *Moral Theology in Fielding, Sterne, and Goldsmith* (Frankfurt Am Main: Peter Lang, 2007).

Murdoch, Alexander. *British History 1660 – 1832: National Identity and Local Culture.* (London: Macmillan, 1999).

Murray, Julie, 'Company Rules: Burke, Hastings, and the Spectre of the Modern Liberal State,' *Eighteenth Century Studies,* Vol. 41. No. 1 (Fall, 2007), 55-69.

Navickas, Katrina, '"That sash will hang you": Political Clothing and Adornment in England, 1780—1840, *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 3 (JULY 2010), 540-565,

Nechtman, Willman W., *Nabobs: Empire and Identity in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Norman, Edward, *Roman Catholicism in England from the Elizabethan Settlement to the Second Vatican Council* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).

Nussbaum, Felicity, *The Limits of the Human: Fictions of Anomaly Race, and Gender in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Ogée, Frederic, (ed.), *"Better in France?": The Circulation of Ideas Across the Channel in the Eighteenth Century* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2005).

O'Toole, Fintan, *A Traitor's Kiss: The Life of Richard Brinsley Sheridan* (New York: FSG, 1998).

Ozouf, Mona, 'War and Terror in French Revolutionary Discourse (1792 – 1794)', *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 56, No. 4 (Dec. 1984), 579-597.

Pares, Richard, 'George III and the Politicians' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Vol. 1. (1951), 127 – 151.

Park, Julie, *The Self and It: Novel Objects in Eighteenth-Century England* (Stanford: Stanford University Oress, 2010).

- "Pains and Pleasures of the Automaton: Frances Burney's Mechanics of Coming Out" *Eighteenth-Century Studies* Vol. 40, No. 1 (Fall, 2006), 23-49.

Perry, Ruth, *Novel Relations: The Transformation of Kinship in English Literature and Culture, 1748 – 1818* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Peters, Timothy J., and Allan Beveridge, 'The madness of King George III: a Psychiatric Re-assessment' *History of Psychiatry,* Vol.21 No.1, 20-37.

Philp, Mark (ed.), *Resisting Napoleon: The British Response to the Threat of Invasion* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

Pincus, Steve, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009).

Pink, Emma E., 'Frances Burney's Camilla: "To Print my Grand Work … by Subscription."' *Eighteenth Century Studies,* Vol. 40, No. 1 (Fall, 2006), 51-68.

Pittock, Murray, *Material Culture and Sedition: 1688 – 1760: Treacherous Objects, Secret Places* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006).

- *Celtic Identity and the British Image* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999).

Porter, Roy, *English Society in the 18th-Century* (London: Penguin, 1991).

Price, Fiona, ed. *Reinventing Liberty: Nation, Commerce and the British Historical Novel from Walpole to Scott* (Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2016).

Priest, Wilfred, (ed.), *Re-interpreting Blackstone's Commentaries: A Seminal Text in National and International Contexts* (Oxford and Portland, Oregon: Hart Publishing, 2014)

Randall, Adrian, *Riotous Assemblies: Popular Protest in Hanoverian England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Rice, David A., 'Combine Against the Devil: The Anglican Church and the French Refugee Clergy in the French Revolution', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, Vol. 50, No. 3 (September, 1981).

Roberts, Matthew, *Political Movements in Urban England, 1832 – 1914* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

Robinson, Nicholas, 'Caricature and the Regency Crisis: An Irish Perspective' *Eighteenth-Century Ireland / Iris an dá chultúr*, Vol. 1 (1986), 157-176.

Rodriguez, Catherine M., 'The History of a Novel's Travels Abroad: Foreign Editions of Frances Burney's "Cecilia"' *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, Vol. 99, No. 4 (December 2005), 539-571.

Rogers, Nicholas, *Crowds, Culture, and Politics in Georgian Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

Rudé, George F.E., ‘The Gordon Riots; A Study of the Rioters and their Victims: The Alexander Prize Essay’ *Royal Historical Society Transactions* 5th Series, vi. (London, 1956), 93 – 114.

- *The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England 1730–1848* (London, 1964).

Sabor, Peter, ‘“Altered, improved, copied, abridged”: Alexandre d’Arblay’s Revisions to Burney’s Edwy and Elgiva’, *Lumen,* Vol. 14, 127 – 137.

Schama, Simon,*Citizens: AChronical of the French Revolution* (London: Penguin, 1989).

Scheuermann, Mona, *Social Protest in the Eighteenth-Century Novel* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1985).

Sewell, Keith, *Herbert Butterfield and His Interpretation of History* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

Shilliam, Nicola J., ‘"Cocardes Nationales and Bonnets Rouges": Symbolic Headdresses of the French Revolution’ *Journal of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston*, Vol. 5 (1993), 104-131

Simms, Brendan, *Three Victories and a Defeat: The Rise and Fall of the First British Empire* (London: Penguin, 2008).

Simms, Brendan, and Torsten Riotte (Eds.), *The Hanoverian Dimension in British History, 1714 – 1837* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Siskin, Clifford, *The Work of Writing: Literature and Social Change in Britain, 1700 – 1830* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).

Skinner, Gillian, 'Professionalism, Performance and Private Theatricals in Frances Burney's 'The Wanderer'.', *Romanticism*., Vol.18 No.3, 294-305.

Smith, Hannah, 'The Idea of a Protestant Monarchy in Britain, 1714 – 1760,' *Past and Present*, No. 185 (Nov. 2004), 91 – 118.

Sorenson, Janet, *The Grammar of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Stafford, William, *English Feminists and Their Opponents in the 1790s: Unsex'd and Proper Females* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002).

Starkie, Andrew, *The Birth of the Modern Church of England: The Bangorian Controversy, 1716–1721* (Woodbridge, 2007).

Straub, Kristina, *Divided Fictions: Fanny Burney and Feminine Strategy* (Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1987).

Streete, Adrian, *Apocalypse and Anti-Catholicism in Seventeenth-Century English Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

Stott, Anne, *Hannah More: The First Victorian* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Tadmor, Naomi., *Family and Friends in Eighteenth-Century England: Household, Kinship and Patronage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Taylor, Stephen, Richard Connors, and Clyve Jones, (eds.), *Hanoverian Britain and Empire: Essays in Memory of Phillip Lawson* (London: Boydel and Brewer, 1998).

Thadeus, Janice Farrar, *Frances Burney: A Literary Life* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000).

Thomas, Keith, *Religion and the Decline of Magic,* (London: Penguin, 1991).

Thompson, Andrew C., *George II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011).

Thompson, E.P., *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Penguin, 2013).

Thormählen, Marianne, *The Brontës and Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Twidale, Kathleen M., *Sensibility in Frances Burney's Novels* [Unpublished PhD Thesis] University of Adelaide, July 1994.

Vessilli, Claudia Marina, *Cecilia tra I <<courtesy books>> e la Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (Rome: Edizioni dell'ateneo & bizzarri: 1979).

Vickery, Amanda, *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (New Haven and Lonodn: Yale University Press, 1998).

Wahba, Magdi, 'Madame De Genlis in England,' *Comparative Literature*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Summer, 1961), 221-238.

Wahrman, Dror, *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004).

Wallace, Beth Kowalski, '"Penance and mortification forever": Jane Austen and the Ambient Noise of Catholicism, *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature,* Vol 31, Nos 1-2, Spring/Fall 2012, 159-180.

Waterfield, Daniel, *Catholics and Catholicism in the Novels of Frances Burney* [unpublished MA dissertation] (Liverpool: University of Liverpool, 2014).

- '"My Brain is on fire!" Anglican Womanhood and the Limits of Politeness in Frances Burney's Cecilia', *JECS,* Vol. 41, Issue 1, March 2019, 49 – 66.

Weiner, Margery, *The French Exiles, 1789 – 1815* (London: John Murray, 1960).

Wenner, Barbara Britton, *Prospect and Refuge in the Landscape of Jane Austen* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

White, Jerry, *London in the Eighteenth century: A Great and Monstrous Thing* (London: Vintage, 2012).

Withey, Alun, *Technology, Self Fashioning, and Politeness in Eighteenth-Century Britain: Refined Bodies* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).

Wohlcke, Anne, *The 'Perpetual Fair': Gender, Disorder, and Urban Amusement in Eighteenth Century London* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2014).

Wood, Lisa, *Modes of Discipline: Women, Conservatism and the Novel After the French Revolution* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2003).

Woodworth, Megan, '"If a man dared act for himself: Family Romance and Independence in Frances Burney's Cecilia.' *Eighteenth Century Fiction*, Vol 22, No. 2, (Winter 2009), 355-370.

Young, Francis, *English Catholics and the Supernatural* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013).

Zonitch, Barbara, *Familiar Violence*: *Gender and Social Upheaval in the Novels of Frances Burney* (London: Associated University Presses, 1997).